



Uruguay:

## 'Broad Front'

## Suffers

## Defeat

SEREGNI: "Broad Front" candidate counts chickens before they're hatched.

## *Lon Nol's 'Worst Defeat in 20 Months'*

## War Over Prize of Bangla Desh

# Officers Told: Stand and Be Counted

The U. S. Defense Department is reported to be compiling for Congress a survey that could turn out to be highly embarrassing. The survey, which is supposed to be handed over to the legislators by December 31, is expected to indicate the number of high-ranking military officers who take jobs with government contractors when they retire. It is also supposed to show the amount of migration in the other direction—the number of company officials who take management jobs in the Pentagon.

Big corporations have long been aware that a few retired generals on the board of directors is a tremendous asset when trying to peddle a new means of mass destruction to the military. It has also been suggested that the hiring of retired military officers could occasionally be interpreted as a payoff to individuals who were instrumental in getting the Pentagon to purchase a particular weapon.

As long ago as 1959, a Congressional investigation disclosed that no fewer than 768 retired officers of the rank of colonel or higher were employed by the 100 largest defense contractors. By 1969, according to the November 27 issue of *Business Week*, the number of such employees had increased to 2,122.

One corporation—Lockheed Aircraft—had no fewer than 210 former high-ranking officers on its payroll.

Neither the 1959 nor 1969 survey indicated how many civilian officials in the Pentagon formerly worked for defense contractors. This figure could be equally illuminating, since such individuals can be presumed to retain a certain company loyalty—particularly if they have been promised their old jobs back at some future date.

Assuming that the data is provided to Congress on schedule, it will not necessarily be made public. Knowledge of the special skills possessed by officials in the Pentagon could, after all, be very useful to potential enemies—such as the taxpayers who are paying their salaries. □

## In This Issue

- |                | FEATURES  |
|----------------|---|
|                | 1089 "Group of 10" Haggles Over Paying for Indochina War U. S. A.                                       |
|                | 1098 Liberals in Pursuit of the Youth Vote  |
|                | 1098 Charge Textile Industry Paid Off Nixon<br>INDOCHINA WAR  |
|                | 1083 Lon Nol's "Worst Defeat in 20 Months of War"<br>BANGLA DESH  |
| Jon Rothschild | 1084 India, Pakistan at War Over Prize of Bangla Desh<br>JORDAN   |
|                | 1085 The Assassination of Premier Wasfi Tal<br>ANTIWAR  |
|                | 1086 April 22 Set for Mass Antiwar Actions in U. S.<br>URUGUAY  |
| Joseph Hansen  | 1086 The "Broad Front" Suffers Defeat<br>INDIA  |
|                | 1088 Leftists Murdered in West Bengal Prison<br>TURKEY  |
|                | 1090 Premier Resigns for Second Time<br>IRAN  |
|                | 1090 Shah Seizes Three Arab Islands   |
| Javad Sadeeg   | 1092 Maoists "Explain" Peking's Foreign Policy<br>MEXICO  |
|                | 1091 Guerrillas Win Release of Prisoners<br>FRANCE  |
|                | 1091 Maspero Fined for "Defaming" Police  |
|                | 1097 Paris Committee Scores Repression in Peru<br>YUGOSLAVIA  |
|                | 1091 Mandel Speaks on Trotskyism<br>JAPAN   |
|                | 1092 Massive Strikes Against Okinawa Treaty<br>HAITI  |
|                | 1093 Nixon to Increase Support for Duvalier?<br>GREAT BRITAIN   |
|                | 1094 Workers Demonstrate Against Rising Unemployment<br>NEW ZEALAND                                     |
|                | 1094 Government Smashes Seamen's Union<br>ITALY   |
| Livio Maitan   | 1096 A Decisive Phase<br>REVIEWS  |
| Gerry Foley    | 1099 A Concrete Account of the Crisis in Ireland  |
|                | 1100 Three Revolutionary Plays in London<br>DOCUMENTS   |
|                | 1101 Hundreds of Unionists Among Ceylon Prisoners   |
|                | 1102 Repression of Striking Peruvian Miners   |
|                | 1103 Protest the Repression in Peru!  |
|                | 1103 Position of the PRT in Uruguayan Elections<br>DRAWINGS   |
| Copain         | 1081 Liber Seregni Mosquera; 1093, Jean-Claude Duvalier;<br>1095, Martha Mitchell; 1098, Strom Thurmond |

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.  
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.  
MANAGING EDITOR: Allen Myers.  
COPY EDITOR: Ruth Schein.  
EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, J.V. Hanley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders.  
BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.  
ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.  
TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Lawrence Rand.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, Black, and women's liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guemeene, Paris 4, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1971 by Intercontinental Press.

## Lon Nol's 'Worst Defeat in 20 Months of War'

The army of Lon Nol retreated in disorder from two towns northeast of Pnompenh December 1 and 2 as a much heralded offensive ended in disaster for Nixon's puppet regime.

The offensive, launched in August, involved 20,000 troops backed by U.S. bombers. Their objective was to open Highway 6 between Pnompenh and Kompong Thom, eighty miles north of the capital. While a part of the force succeeded in reaching Kompong Thom, the liberation forces launched a counterattack in November.

"Major roads out of the capital were cut," the November 27 *Far Eastern Economic Review* reported, "as the communists showed impressive muscle power in precisely those areas where government troops had lately claimed victories and the annihilation of communist concentrations. The most disastrous defeat for the government was at Rumlong, 60 miles north of Phnom Penh, where government troops suffered over 1,000 casualties before they gave up attempts to seize the town."

Several units of Lon Nol's forces were reported all but annihilated in fighting that preceded the hasty retreat from Baray and Kompong Thmar.

"Testimony to the savage fighting around Baray," the Associated Press reported December 1, "was the arrival of a bedraggled group of 83 Cambodian soldiers at Skoun, a headquarters city about 20 miles to the south. Their leader was a sergeant, who said this was all that was left of a 600-man battalion after three months of fighting.

"'All our officers are either dead or wounded,' the sergeant reported, adding that his group retreated from a battle south of Baray and took a day and a night to reach Skoun."

A December 2 United Press International dispatch said that half of the 20,000-man force was "virtually destroyed as a fighting unit."

"Government sources," the dispatch added, "reported that United States warplanes were called in to destroy tanks and other war material abandoned by the Cambodians so that the equipment would not fall into enemy hands."

The December 3 *Washington Post* quoted "military sources" as calling the loss of Baray "Cambodia's worst defeat in 20 months of war."

The paper reported that at least one U.S. airplane had been shot down north of Baray, on November 30. It described the rout of Lon Nol's troops:

"At Skoun, a strong point 25 miles south of Baray, a long stream of bedraggled soldiers, women and children were observed making their way down the full length of Highway 6 to Phnom Penh. Some were jammed aboard requisitioned buses and others limped along on bleeding feet.

"Many troops on the road were without officers and units were mixed up in confusion following the race to get away from the collapse of the front line. . . .

"The road is now cut in many places and the remaining garrisons are completely fragmented. Many of the retreating troops said they had been attacked on the way."

Lon Nol's defeat was all the more stunning in that his forces were heavily backed by U.S. planes and a diversionary invasion of eastern Cambodia by more than 25,000 Saigon troops. In an editorial December 5, the *New York Times* warned that the defeat "offers fresh evidence of the terrible vulnerability of President Nixon's Indochina policy."

"Massive United States air power," the editorial added, "which is the obvious keystone of President Nixon's hopes for pursuing the war in Indochina without the use of American ground forces, has failed conspicuously to stem the Communist assault along Route Six. But in Cambodia, as in Vietnam and Laos, the United States planes are devastating the countryside and helping to generate masses of displaced persons and untold numbers of innocent casualties.

"It is possible that the current Cambodian setback will prove only temporary, as has been the case with some similar reverses in Laos. But it is more likely that the Cambodian rout is only a portent of things to come if President Nixon persists in the vain pursuit of a military solution in Indochina."

The extent of U.S. air raids on Cambodia is indicated by a report prepared by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). Terence Smith wrote in the December 5 *New York Times* that the study "asserts that more than two million Cambodians have been driven from their homes at different times since the war spread to their country in the spring of 1970."

The population of Pnompenh has more than doubled because of the influx of refugees, and the toll may be greater in other areas. Iver Peterson wrote from Pnompenh in the December 2 *New York Times*:

"According to an [American] embassy official, Cambodian sources put the number of migrants around Kompong Cham alone at 800,000."

The Nixon administration is not even pretending to provide for the needs of the refugees it is creating. The GAO report observes: "The policy of the United States is not to become involved with the problems of civilian war victims in Cambodia."

This was confirmed by a State Department spokesman who was quoted by Smith as saying it was the administration's position that "since only a limited amount of money is available, we can most effectively focus it on military and economic assistance."

Every advance of the liberation forces is seen by Nixon as an opportunity to spread destruction over a still wider area. Peterson recounted the following typical story from a peasant driven from Tuol Leap by U.S. bombs:

"When the Communists came all the houses were still standing. But after they spent the night inside the village, the airplanes came and started bombing, so we all left." □

### Next Issue

Our next issue will contain a review of significant developments of 1971, plus our annual index. This will be the final issue of the year, since we do not publish during the last week in December or the first week in January.

# India, Pakistan at War Over Prize of Bangla Desh

By Jon Rothschild

On December 3 the simmering India-Pakistan border confrontations exploded into full-scale war. The long-expected Pakistani attack across the western border was unleashed, with Pakistani air force planes striking at least seven Indian towns and air bases. The deepest strike came at Agra, about 120 miles south of New Delhi, the Indian capital.

The same evening Indian President V. V. Giri declared a state of national emergency. At midnight Prime Minister Indira Gandhi announced in a radio speech that eight cities near the West Pakistani border had been bombed. She virtually declared war: "Today, the war in Bangla Desh has become a war on India, and this imposes upon me, my Government, and the people of India an awesome responsibility. We have no other option but to put our country on a war footing."

Yahya Khan, charging that Indian forces had crossed the western frontier, invoked the help of god in summoning the West Pakistanis to holy war (jihad) "to give a crushing reply to the enemy."

Yahya's assertion that India initiated the fighting in the West is dubious at best. Early reports indicated that the Pakistani army had moved into Indian territory and was holding some Indian villages. It seemed clear that Yahya's forces were moving to counterbalance Indian and Mukti Bahini (Bengali Liberation Forces) penetrations in East Bengal, where a major offensive had been launched two weeks before. As of December 5, the Indians were defensively oriented in the West, trying to hold their ground against the advancing Pakistani troops. In the East, however, Indian officials finally openly acknowledged that their forces were involved in a major push to break the Pakistani army. "My aim is to make the Pakistan armed forces surrender, to get Bangla Desh to have their own type of government," Lieutenant General Ajit Singh Aurora, commander of the Indian army on the eastern front, told reporters December 4. A senior In-

dian official added, "I tell you that no holds are barred."

Aurora would not disclose the number of Indian troops involved, but as many as 125,000 have been encircling East Bengal for the past several weeks.

The eruption of all-out war was accompanied by a U. S. request for an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council. Yahya favored calling such a meeting, hoping to get a UN or great-power intervention to forestall his impending defeat in East Bengal.

As the meeting was convened, it became clear that the U. S. delegation, while cloaking its words in the usual hypocritical rhetoric about peace, security, and national independence, was forthrightly taking a pro-Yahya position. Chief U. S. delegate George Bush submitted a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire, the withdrawal of troops to their own countries, and the presence of a UN "peace-keeping force."

The proposal, which closely paralleled Yahya's demands, was blocked by the negative vote of the Soviet Union. Great Britain and France abstained, Poland voted against, while the other eleven delegations, including China's, voted in favor.

To make sure that world opinion would get the message, the U. S. State Department announced December 4 that it held India to blame for the outbreak of war. "We believe," said an official who refused to be identified, "that since the beginning of the crisis, Indian policy, in a systematic way, has led to the perpetuation of the crisis, and that India bears the major responsibility for the broader hostilities that have ensued."

The day before, acting with uncommon alacrity, the U. S. government announced that all remaining export licenses for military equipment to India had been canceled, because of "continuing Indian incursions into Pakistan."

The United States was joined by China in the Security Council not on-

ly in the vote on the former's resolution. India and the Soviet Union had urged that representatives of the Bangla Desh government-in-exile be invited to the meeting. Pakistan, referring to the Bangla Desh delegates as "so-called representatives of a particular entity," adamantly opposed the suggestion. The Chinese delegate was even more slanderous in his description of the Bengalis. The refugees, he said, were nothing but "rebellious elements," and seating them would constitute interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan. (So much for Mao's famous aphorism, "To rebel is justified.")

The statement of Smar Sen, the Indian delegate, affirmed India's determination to clear the refugees out of West Bengal. "We cannot take any more refugees," he said repeatedly. Any Security Council resolution that did not provide for the return of the refugees would be rejected by India, he added.

Fearing the growing strength of the Mukti Bahini and its powerful appeal to the nationalist sentiments of the Bengali population of West Bengal, the Gandhi regime decided to strike hard at the Pakistani army, force it to withdraw from East Bengal, and create a Bangla Desh government tied to the Indian ruling class. This accounts for Gandhi's support of the present Bangla Desh government-in-exile, composed mostly of representatives of the Awami League.

It is doubtful that Yahya can avoid a military defeat in East Bengal. His army has been unable to suppress the Mukti Bahini fighting alone and with but little material aid from India and other sources. With the addition of thousands of well-armed and well-trained Indian regulars, his already precarious military situation is likely to become disastrous in a short time.

For India, though, the victory may well be a fleeting one. The establishment of an independent Bangla Desh will be a significant victory for the Bengali revolution that can only serve to reinforce the desire for national

freedom and opposition to tutelage from any quarter. The Bengalis have not suffered more than 1,000,000 deaths in order to exchange Pakistani for Indian control.

In seeking to end the "refugee problem" by trying to dominate and di-

rect the Bengali revolution, the Indian bourgeoisie has engaged in a dangerous gamble. If Yahya is forced out of Bangla Desh, Gandhi may well find herself trying to take his place. There is no reason to believe that she would be any more successful. □

a life-long practitioner of policies designed to perpetuate the existence of the state of Israel. More Palestinian fighters have been killed by Tal and his agents than by the Israeli army.

On November 29 Hussein named Ahmed Lawzi as Tal's successor. Lawzi, another Hashemite flunky, vowed to "follow the path" of his predecessor. The policies of the regime will certainly not change for the better because of the assassination.

At the same time, it is possible that the latest attempts at "reconciling" the fedayeen and the monarchy may be disrupted. Hussein is almost sure to use the assassination as an excuse to intensify the repression against the commandos. This will put an even greater strain on negotiations that are already going badly.

Exactly who was responsible for the act remains unclear. *Le Monde's* December 1 issue described the Black September as a group of dissident Fateh members who oppose all negotiations with Hussein. But the November 29 *New York Times* carried a report that the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine had issued a statement in Beirut that their cadres were responsible. A PFLP spokesman refused to comment on the report that the Black September had shot Tal. □

## Jordan

# The Assassination of Premier Wasfi Tal

On November 28, as he was entering the Sheraton Hotel in Cairo after attending a session of the Arab League's Joint Defense Council, Jordanian Premier Wasfi Tal was stopped by a man holding a revolver in one hand and a grenade in the other. "Abu Iyad is dead, but the Palestinian people are not!" the man shouted. Then he and two companions opened fire. Tal, one of the ringleaders in King Hussein's brutal assault on the Palestinians in 1970, died instantly.

The attackers, reportedly members of a Palestinian commando group called Black September, fled. Two were seized by police in the vicinity of the hotel; another was captured in a nearby apartment; a fourth was arrested later. Egyptian Prosecutor General Mohammed Maher Hassan announced that all four would be charged with premeditated murder, possession of firearms and ammunition without a license, and taking part in a criminal accord to kill.

President Anwar el-Sadat sent Hussein a message of condolence and vowed to "punish the guilty."

Others in the Arab world reacted differently. Feelings among the Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied West Bank tended toward fear of possible murderous reprisals by Hussein against their friends and relatives on the East Bank, rather than toward sympathy for the executed butcher. In the past, fedayeen publications have usually referred to Hussein's right-hand man as "Tal Aviv," a particularly apt characterization.

Born in 1920, Tal was educated at the American University in Beirut. In 1941 he entered a British-run military academy in what was then the mandate of Palestine. He served several years in the British army, and in 1948 joined the Arab Liberation Army, a neocolonialist force dom-

inated by British and Faroukian officers.

After that army was defeated in a disorganized and misled struggle against the Israeli army in 1948-49, Tal joined the Syrian army. He soon entered the Jordanian civil service, where he became known for his absolute loyalty to King Hussein.

Tal was the head of the Jordanian government on five different occasions. His last term in that capacity began just after the defeat of the fedayeen in September 1970. His task was to isolate the resistance movement politically and follow that up with military attacks aimed at driving the Palestinian revolutionists from Jordanian territory. He carried that task out with some success, using the usual methods—a fanatical, Islam-oriented propaganda-barrage against the fedayeen, rumor-mongering, shelling of commando bases, etc.

As the power of the resistance in Jordan declined, Tal became increasingly open in his anti-Semitism. In the November 30 *Le Monde*, correspondent Eric Rouleau tells of lunching with Tal and Hussein. The only thing Tal had to add to Hussein's comments, reported Rouleau, was that Israelis and Jews of all nationalities—all leftists, of course—were practically running the Palestinian liberation organizations.

Tal devoted the major portion of a June 1, 1970, speech at a Jordanian university to "the world Jewish conspiracy." His principal documentation of this "plot" was the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," the notorious forgery concocted by the Czarist secret service.

But despite his anti-Semitism (and in some respects because of it), the Israeli government has good reason to mourn Tal's passing. While verbally an opponent of Zionism, Tal was

## Calley's Imitators

"People who kill for money are professionals," reads a sign in the bar of a U. S. Navy base in the Mekong Delta. "People who kill for fun are sadists. People who kill for money and fun are Seals."

The Seals—the name is an acronym for Sea, Air, Land—are a navy "intelligence" unit that specializes in commando raids and the murder of suspected members of the National Liberation Front. Their operations in Vietnam are now coming to an end, Craig R. Whitney reported in the November 29 *New York Times*. The reason has nothing to do with any supposed "winding down" of the war, but with political considerations:

"Seal officers say they [Seal operations] were stopped because of the political sensitivity of the Navy command here [Saigon] and because some members of the commando teams in the field have become afraid that their activities might bring down on them the kind of prosecution that convicted First Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. in the massacre of civilians at Mylai."

Among these activities has been cooperation with Saigon's secret police in the CIA's "Operation Phoenix"—the program of kidnapping and assassinating Thieu's political opponents in the villages. □

## April 22 Set for Mass Antiwar Actions

More than 1,400 antiwar activists at the convention of the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) in Cleveland voted December 5 to build mass demonstrations in New York City and on the West Coast April 22.

The convention, one of the periodic assemblies at which NPAC decides its activities, drew participants from forty-one states.

There was general agreement on the perspective of calling a "Peace Action Week" April 16-22, culminating in mass demonstrations on the East and West coasts April 22.

A resolution submitted by NPAC coordinators Ruth Gage-Colby, Jerry Gordon, Jim Lafferty, and John T. Williams proposed that the East Coast action be held in Washington, D. C. A counterproposal, while agreeing with the general perspectives of the coordinators' mass-action resolution, argued that the East Coast demon-

stration should be held in New York, pointing out that an action in the national capital during an election year could be easily distorted by the press to appear as part of a "Dump Nixon" pro-Democratic party campaign.

The meeting adopted the latter proposal by an overwhelming majority.

Elected as NPAC coordinators were Debbie Bustin, national coordinator of the Student Mobilization Committee; Stephanie Coontz, a member of NPAC's coordinating committee from Seattle; and Katherine Williford, coordinator of the Atlanta, Georgia, Peace Action Coalition.

The April 22 West Coast demonstration is to be held in a California city to be agreed upon in consultation with antiwar groups from the western states.

The convention unanimously adopted a call for international solidarity actions April 22. □

reported 200,000 while the *New York Times* cut the figure to 100,000.

It was also an extremely spirited demonstration, reminding observers of the fervor at rallies in Havana in the early days of the Cuban revolution.

Slogans chanted by the more radical participants were readily picked up by tens of thousands of voices, swelling into a roar as they passed for miles along the line of march. Here are some of them:

"El pueblo armado jamás engañado!" (People in arms are never cheated.) "Por la tierra con Sendic!" (For land with Sendic [the leader of the Tupamaros].) "Al gobierno fascista el pueblo te responde con la revolución!" (The people reply to the fascist government with revolution.) "Ni yanquis ni fascista, América socialista!" (Neither Yankees nor fascist, for a socialist America.) "Lucha! Lucha! Lucha! No dejes de luchar por un gobierno obrero, obrero y popular!" (Fight! Fight! Fight! Don't stop fighting for a workers' government, workers' and people's.)

The size of the demonstration and its militant tone appeared to be in direct answer to the flood of lies and red-baiting that partisans of the Pacheco regime had engaged in to intimidate supporters of the Broad Front and to influence the vote.

However, the enthusiasm of the Montevideo demonstrators, who were quite youthful in the majority, was not registered at the polls. This was to be expected. The electorate, even when it includes the bulk of the working class, generally lags behind events, tending to register past moods and past relationships in the class struggle rather than the current reality. The voters in Montevideo who waited for hours in long lines to cast their ballots on Sunday were noticeably older than the contingents that marched in the streets on Wednesday.

Another reason for the high hopes of the organizers of the Broad Front was the victory last year of a similar formation in Chile, the Unidad Popular (People's Unity) headed by Salvador Allende Gossens. In October 1970, a month after Allende's triumph, the first trial balloons were floated in Montevideo on making a similar try; and the response, particu-

000. The estimated population of the entire country in 1970 was only 2,900,000.

## Uruguay

### The 'Broad Front' Suffers Defeat

By Joseph Hansen

As of November 30, the outcome of the November 28 elections in Uruguay was still in doubt. The Colorado party held the lead with 575,690 votes as against 565,556 for the National party (Blancos) and 252,534 for the Broad Front (Frente Amplio).

Of the seven presidential candidates of the Colorados, Juan María Bordaberry, the successor handpicked by President Jorge Pacheco Areco, was in the lead. Wilson Ferreira Alduante held the front position among the three candidates running on Blanco slates. With 10 percent of the vote still to be counted, it may take several weeks to determine which of the twins in Uruguay's two-party system won the presidency and control of the 129-seat parliament.

Although he quickly conceded defeat after seeing the early returns, Gen-

eral Liber Seregni Mosquera was perhaps the one most surprised by the defeat of the Broad Front. On November 26, the presidential candidate of the popular-front formation went on television and radio to give a victory speech, so certain was he that he would be swept into office.

Seregni's confidence evidently stemmed from his estimate of the meaning of the giant demonstration in Montevideo November 24 behind the banners of the Broad Front.

By all accounts it was the biggest turnout yet seen in Uruguay. The Montevideo press reported that half a million persons had joined in the march.<sup>1</sup> The Paris daily *Le Monde*

1. The impressiveness of this figure can be judged from the fact that Montevideo's estimated population in 1968 was 1,348,-

larly among intellectuals and circles influenced by the Communist party, showed that the effort would gain considerable support.

The main components of the Broad Front consisted of the Communist party, two factions that broke away from the Colorado and Blanco parties, the Christian Democrats, the Socialist party, a number of prominent intellectuals, and a gamut of groupings, ranging from unions to cultural associations.

Among the participating vanguard organizations were the Movimiento de Independientes "26 de Marzo" ("March 26" Movement of Independents, a formation representing the viewpoint of the Tupamaros),<sup>2</sup> the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Revolutionary Workers party headed by Juan Posadas, which is sometimes mistaken as Trotskyist because of its claims), and the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (Revolutionary Workers party, a Trotskyist grouping that has proclaimed its adherence to the Fourth International but that has not yet been accepted as a section).

The main architect of the Broad Front was the Communist party. Its objective was to divert the current upsurge into safe electoral channels. As proof positive that it hoped to play the role of saviour of the capitalist system rather than its destroyer, the Arismendi leadership of the CP made sure that the three leading candidates of the Broad Front would be acceptable to ruling circles in Uruguay. The ex-General Liber Seregni and Dr. Juan José Crottogini were nominated for the presidency and vice-presidency, and Dr. Hugo Villar for mayor of Montevideo.

As the Buenos Aires Trotskyist weekly *La Verdad* correctly noted in its issue of September 29, these nominations, to which "bourgeois circles reacted favorably," represented "another step" in structuring the Broad Front "as a variant of reformism, acceptable to the bourgeois system."<sup>3</sup>

In its political purpose and main structure (its subordination to a bourgeois leadership), the Broad Front constituted a Latin American variant

of the popular front long utilized by the Stalinists and Social Democrats in wheeling and dealing with bourgeois parties in the electoral arena.

It is true that the Broad Front was not a mere replica of the popular fronts seen in Europe in the thirties. Like every political formation in Latin America that seeks popular support today, it stressed anti-imperialism.

Its thirty-point platform included the following planks: An "agrarian reform," the "nationalization of private banks," the "nationalization of the main firms engaged in foreign trade," and "energetic industrial action by the state, including nationalization of the meat-packing industry."

But fitting its platform to the radical mood of the Uruguayan masses did not change the essence of the Broad Front. Like the popular fronts seen elsewhere in the world, it was designed to divert the masses from the road of revolutionary struggle.

The role played by the Tupamaros was of special interest. During the latter part of the electoral campaign, they desisted from guerrilla warfare so as not to embarrass the Broad Front.

*La Verdad* said of this: "The immediate strategy of the Tupamaros would itself seem to help open up and smooth the road to an electoral triumph for the popular front."

Quite a few of the groupings participating in the Broad Front ran their own slates of candidates (save for the presidency and vice-presidency), which was possible under Uruguay's democratic electoral system. But the Tupamaros, although under heavy pressure to follow the others in this, refused to run a slate of their own.

Through the Movimiento de Independientes "26 de Marzo" they stated publicly on several occasions that they were leaving it up to their followers to vote for whatever slates they wanted to.

For instance, in the November 26 issue of the Montevideo weekly *Marcha*, they explained why they were not running their own candidates. "We are independents. And we are organizing in that way. We do not aspire to electoral burdens. We merely support the common candidates of the Front."

They called attention to a previous declaration in which they had explained that they consider it "more important to organize and train the

ranks of the people for the coming decisive struggles than to divert forces in selecting figures to be proposed for consideration in the electoral contest."

The Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT) followed a different course. The PRT began only two years ago as a very small grouping of Trotskyists. The intensity of their activities would do credit to a group many times their size, and they have made encouraging progress, including establishing a press of their own. During the latter part of the election campaign, besides huge quantities of leaflets, they published their paper *Tendencia Revolucionaria* (Revolutionary Tendency) as a six- to eight-page weekly.

When the Broad Front was first projected in October 1970, the PRT decided to take an active attitude toward it. In the first phase, in the numerous meetings that were held all over to discuss the issues on which the proposed front should take a stand, the PRT militants did two things: (1) They argued that the platform should be decided through a democratic discussion among the ranks. (2) They presented the program of Trotskyism, stressing democratic and transitional demands in particular.

They gained a favorable hearing, but were not strong enough to block the Communist party from imposing on the Broad Front the kind of platform it wanted.

Similarly on the question of the candidates of the Broad Front, the PRT advocated nominating workers. They stressed the need for labor to run its own candidates and strongly criticized the Communist party for not appealing to the Convención Nacional de Trabajadores (National Workers Convention, the big trade union) to join the Broad Front and run a slate of its candidates on an independent basis.

Again, the PRT was not strong enough to carry its position, although it received a favorable hearing at the meetings where its speakers took the floor.

When the architects of the Broad Front had settled on Seregni and Crottogini, the PRT decided to run a slate of its own. Under the Uruguayan electoral system this was possible only as a sub-slate (sub-lema) of the Broad Front.

Here the PRT ran into a snag. The top committee of the Broad Front

2. This was listed erroneously in an article that appeared in translation in our October 25 issue (p. 916) as "July 26 Movement."

3. See the October 25, 1971, issue of *Intercontinental Press*.



ruled that while any grouping could run what candidates it wished for local offices or as senators or deputies, all groupings were barred from running any candidates for president and vice president of the country and mayor of Montevideo except Seregni, Crottogini, and Villar.

This meant that in contrast to the Colorado party with its seven presidential candidates and the National party with its three, the Broad Front would appear on the ballot with only one presidential candidate—Seregni.

The ruling was highly undemocratic. Its purpose was purely factional, since all votes cast for rival candidates of the Broad Front would have counted against the Colorado and National parties. The ruling was intended to block vanguard groupings like the PRT from exercising their right to gain a line on the ballot that would indicate their proletarian opposition to Seregni, thereby complicating things for the publicity experts engaged in converting the nondescript figure of Seregni into the "choice of the people."

The PRT decided to bow to this decision since to defy it would have meant exclusion from the ballot. On the ballots listing their slate of workers' candidates, they included the names of Seregni, Crottogini, and Villar under the slogan, "La liberación de los trabajadores es obra de los trabajadores mismos" (The freeing of the workers is the task of the workers themselves).

In my opinion, this was an error. More than a tactical question was involved, since objectively to issue a ballot with Seregni's name on it was to ask voters to vote for him, that is, vote for the bourgeois leadership of the Broad Front. It would have been better to try to make a scandal over the undemocratic ruling and to avoid issuing a ballot that included the name of a figure whose program was in complete opposition to that of the PRT.

It is true that from abroad it is difficult to determine what weight Seregni's name actually represented in Uruguay. Among the groupings that ran slates of their own candidates in addition to Seregni, Crottogini, and Villar, one notices the stress they place in their political advertisements on the candidates identifying their grouping as such and the completely subordinate position they give to Seregni. In

many instances his name is not even included.

It seems, too, that the ballot designations are discounted to a certain extent by the voters. The Broad Front itself appeared on the ballot only by courtesy of the Christian Democratic party, which made its standing place on the ballot available to the Broad Front. Thus every ballot of all the Broad Front slates starts out with the line: "Partido Democrata Cristiano."

But the Christian Democrats were so far from thinking that this meant an automatic vote for their party, that they ran their own slate, designating it in big type as Partido Democrata Cristiano, Lista 808; and they campaigned for votes on that basis.

In addition, it must be noted that in its election literature, the PRT did not campaign at all for Seregni. A good example of what they said can be found in the article from *Tendencia Revolucionaria* published on the eve of the election, which is included elsewhere in this issue.

Nevertheless, the objective meaning

of including the names of Seregni, Crottogini, and Villar on the slate of Candidatos Obreros (Lista 1968) remains.

In Wall Street, the defeat of the Broad Front was received with a sigh of relief. The *New York Times* in an editorial December 3 saw the outcome as giving "one of the traditional parties a new five-year opportunity to transform the country." As an afterthought the editors added: "It may be the last chance for the Uruguayan democracy."

It is doubtful that Uruguayan capitalism will win a five-year breathing space. The deep economic crisis that has racked the country for the past fifteen years continues unabated.

The Uruguayan workers will hardly wait for a half a decade to go through another experience with a broad front. It is much more likely that they will pour into the streets by the hundreds of thousands as they did on November 24—but this time to change the entire system. And they will do it in perhaps less than the ten days that it took the Russian workers in 1917. □

## Leftists Murdered in West Bengal Prison

Six dead, 237 wounded. That was the toll after the crushing of a rebellion November 26 in Alipore prison in West Bengal. Most of the victims were members of the Communist party of India (Marxist) [CPI(M)] or the Naxalite organizations. They were, according to a report in the November 30 *Le Monde*, beaten with clubs.

The rebellion was the latest, and the most serious, in a series of acts of resistance to the Gandhi-supported repression that has been launched throughout West Bengal.

The state is ruled directly by the New Congress party federal government under a provision of the Indian constitution allowing New Delhi to oust any locally elected administration.

Even before December 3, when Gandhi asked for special powers because of the war with Pakistan, the West Bengal government had instituted some exceptional practices. The allowable length of pretrial detention of prisoners, for example, was extended to one year. In a good many cases,

according to *Le Monde*, imprisonment without trial exceeds one year because of the large number of people arrested.

Bands of armed New Congress party youth and lumpen elements from Calcutta's vast slums roam the streets employing terrorist methods against their opponents. Each week, the CPI(M) publishes lists of its members who have fallen victim to the "monstrous repression of the democratic movement."

The frenetic gangsterism of Gandhi's cohorts in West Bengal is designed, in the short run, to ensure their party's domination in the next local elections, which are supposed to take place in February. In the long term, it is the regime's response to the radicalization that has been intensified by the Bangla Desh liberation struggle.

Unfortunately, the political opportunism of both the Naxalites and the CPI(M), combined with their own frequent resort to political terror against opponents, has limited the left's ability to effectively resist the ruling class assault. □



## Group of Ten' Haggles Over Paying for Indochina War

"I think," U. S. Secretary of the Treasury John Connally commented December 1 on the "Group of Ten" currency negotiations, "some progress was made today. We did not reach a decision. We did not solve the problem."

The talks in Rome adjourned the same day to permit negotiators to confer with their governments after the Nixon administration had reversed its previous position and suggested that it would be willing to devalue the dollar 10 percent against gold as part of an agreement establishing new parities among the leading currencies.

Clyde H. Farnsworth reported in the December 2 *New York Times* that Connally had been told by the other negotiators that "10 per cent would be too high. Other countries would follow the United States down."

The inability of the negotiators to find a quick solution to their "problem" is in part due to the fact that there are in reality two problems: the growing deficit in the U. S. balance of payments and Nixon's attempt to use trade measures to force American capitalism's chief competitors to reverse the deficit.

"Secretary Connally," the *Washington Post* observed in a November 26 editorial, "keeps talking as though trade were the same thing as the balance of payments. It is not. From July to September of this year, the net outflow of *merchandise* trade—the excess of imports over exports, in other words—was no more than one-tenth of the deficit in the balance of payments.

"The other nine-tenths of the deficit is nothing but money—capital on its way to new investment, profits, interest, gifts and so forth."

The editorial went on to point out that a large part of the current outflow is speculative capital gambling on a devaluation of the dollar or an upward revaluation of foreign currencies. This means that Nixon's efforts to force currency realignments have at least temporarily resulted in a worsening of the U. S. balance of payments.

In reality, the U. S. payments deficit has consistently been partially off-

set by a trade surplus. Until this year, the U. S. exported more than it imported during every year of this century. The first deficit in balance of payments did not occur until 1950. Since then the cumulative deficit has mounted to \$50,000,000,000.

In the November 29 issue of the liberal weekly *The Nation*, Robert Warren Stevens, associate professor in the graduate school of business at Indiana University Northwest, provides some statistics that indicate the major cause of the payments deficit.

In the years 1960-65, Stevens notes, the "private sector" of the American economy averaged an annual surplus of \$1,500,000,000. (This would include the trade surplus and remittance of profits earned abroad, minus dollars invested abroad.) During the same period, the "public sector" averaged a deficit of \$3,100,000,000, giving an annual payments deficit of \$1,600,000,000.

The average public-sector deficit was broken down as follows: military expenditures, \$2,400,000,000; economic aid, \$300,000,000; all other government expenditures, \$400,000,000.

For the years 1966-70, the overall U. S. payment deficit increased to an annual average of \$2,700,000,000. The surplus in the private sector decreased to \$1,100,000,000, but this decline was more than offset by a change in the figure for economic "aid." During the five-year period, economic "aid" produced an annual average *surplus* of \$600,000,000 in U. S. payments. Stevens explains:

"Economic aid-related transactions have not cost the U. S. basic balance of payments anything since 1962; on the contrary, they have been a sizable earning in the account. That has happened because nearly all new flows of aid are tied to the purchase of U. S. exports, while interest payments on outstanding aid loans and repayments of earlier loans have grown steadily by comparison with gross outflows. When President Nixon told the nation in August that he was cutting foreign economic aid by 10 per cent, he did not add that his purpose was to enable the United States to make even more money on its foreign aid transactions than it had in the past."

The governmental payment deficit during 1966-70 averaged \$3,800,000,000. Nearly 95 percent—\$3,600,000,000—was due to military expenditures abroad. This represented a 50 percent increase in the military expenses deficit, and coincided with the escalation of the war in Indochina.

The Nixon administration has been using an even larger figure in its negotiations with the other capitalist powers, claiming that "defense of the free world" increases the U. S. payments deficit by \$5,000,000,000.

Whatever the precise figure, it is clear that a major part is directly traceable to the Indochina war. The fact that most of the Group of Ten governments regard this adventure as tactically unwise does nothing to increase their willingness to help pay for it.

On the other hand, there is no other power that is capable of policing the world for imperialism, and Nixon's allies can be expected to meet him more than half way—particularly while he continues to wield the heavy club of the 10 percent import surcharge. They have already come considerably more than half way, in the opinion of the *New York Times*, which in a November 24 editorial advised Nixon to stop haggling and settle for what he had already been offered:

"... West Europe and Japan are prepared to join in negotiating monetary reforms and a realignment of currency parities that could provide 90 to 95 per cent of the turnaround the United States needs in its balance of payments. What is blocking negotiations is Mr. Connally's determination to get that extra 5 to 10 per cent gain—and to get it in advance—in the form of unilateral concessions from the allies in trade and defense burden-sharing." □

A Louis Harris poll found that only 11 percent of the American public disagrees with the statement that "most elected officials promise one thing at election time and do something different once in office." Twenty percent disagreed with the charge that "most politicians take graft." The 9 percent shift might be those who realize there's no point in bribing someone who doesn't keep promises.

# Direct Military Rule Looms in Turkey

Turkish Premier Nihat Erim resigned December 3 for the second time in five weeks, apparently as the result of rising pressures tearing apart his military-installed government. After a majority of his cabinet quit, Erim was forced to abandon the pretense of leading a government, although he remains temporarily the head of a caretaker regime.

The ex-premier first resigned October 27 when the Justice party, the largest in parliament, withdrew its support from the ruling "national unity" coalition. At the time, the military chiefs controlling the government from offstage were able to bring the dissident politicians back into line. This time, apparently, it was the opposing faction that forced Erim to step down: "The ministers who resigned reportedly believed that Mr. Erim had made too many compromises with the Justice party, diluting their proposed legislation and decrees involving land reform, taxation and governmental reorganization," a *New York Times* correspondent wrote December 3 from Ankara.

It remains to be seen whether the strong men can restore "discipline" once again among the contending bourgeois interests in parliament.

"Well-placed sources said here tonight that the resignations had increased the possibility that the military's hand may be forced," the *Times* correspondent continued. "In that event, these sources say, Parliament would be suspended and the reforms would be pushed through."

Thus, presumably, if the military cannot get parliament to toe the line, it will rule the country directly, as it threatened to do in March when the present government was established in response to an army ultimatum.

The military's move to establish a "strong" regime came in the face of a rising radicalization of students, workers, and small farmers. A month after taking power, on April 26, the government declared a state of siege and launched a violent witch-hunt, threatening left-wing journalists with prison terms running over a hundred years each. Since that time the repression

has continually widened. In August, the only left party in parliament, the Turkish Labour party, was outlawed.

On the same day Erim resigned, Professor Mumtaz Soysal, who was dean of the political science faculty of the University of Ankara before the army took control of the government, was sentenced to six years and eight months in prison for "promotion of Communism."

The last opposition paper in the country, the weekly *Yeni Ortam*, announced—in an issue that went on sale November 29—that it was forced to stop publication. The only available printer had backed out of his contract with the journal as the result of "advice" given by the head of the military court system in Istanbul, Captain Turgut Akan.

Most press reports claim that the army conceived of a two-pronged of-

fensive to "restore order." The liquidation of the left was to be counterbalanced by a series of reforms to defuse popular discontent.

Although the bourgeois interests represented in parliament see eye to eye on the repression, they are divided over paying the price for pacifying the people. "The reforms have run into strong parliamentary opposition from conservative politicians led by the Justice party," according to the *New York Times* correspondent quoted above.

The army commanders may be tempted now to intervene directly to settle these disputes through establishing an open military dictatorship. The experience of such regimes in Latin America indicates, however, that when the armed forces make themselves into the arbiter between bourgeois interests in an economically unstable situation, they themselves are drawn into conflict. In such cases, clashes of interest tend to develop into armed confrontations threatening to destroy the military apparatus and open the way for popular revolutions. □

## Britain's Israel in the Arab-Persian Gulf

# Shah Seizes Three Arab Islands

At dawn on November 30 the shah of Iran carried out his long-standing threat to seize three Arab islands in the Arab-Persian Gulf. The islands, Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb, and Abu Moussa, are situated between Iran and the northeast corner of the Arabian peninsula. They have a combined population of about 440.

Three Iranian soldiers and four Arab policemen were reported killed during the invasion of Greater Tunb.

The shah claimed he was acting in accord with Great Britain, former ruler of the islands. Later in the day Iraq broke diplomatic relations with Iran and Britain in protest over the invasion. Syria called for an emergency meeting of the Arab League.

On December 1 a mass protest rally was held in Iraq. On December 3 Iraq, Algeria, Libya, and South Yemen requested a meeting of the UN Security Council to discuss the invasion.

The islands had been part of the Ras el-Khaima emirate, one of seven so-called Trucial States (so named because they signed a truce with Britain in 1821 giving England control of the area!). Since 1968, when Britain announced that it would withdraw its military bases east of Suez, the shah has been groomed to fill the "vacuum."

Despite the small size of the region, Britain has been anxious to maintain some sort of control. Oil has been discovered in a number of the emirates; they occupy a strategic position at the point where the Arab-Persian Gulf joins the Gulf of Oman; and to add to the imperialists' problems, the Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arab Gulf has been waging a guerrilla struggle in Oman and Dhufar, just south of the Gulf emirates.

The November 30 invasion was the first overt case of the shah playing an Israeli-type policing role in the region. □

# Guerrillas Win Release of Prisoners

Mexico City

The year seems to be closing with another of the sensational cases that have rocked the press in this country since last spring. On November 26, a commando group affiliated with the guerrillas of Genaro Vázquez Rojas in the state of Guerrero kidnapped the rector of the state university, Dr. Jaime Castrejón Díaz. As a result of this action, nine political prisoners have been released, the first in Mexico to be freed by a commando operation.

This case should have been embarrassing to the Echeverría regime in at least one respect. The government has always denied the existence of guerrillas in Guerrero, although the activities of the Vázquez Rojas group are generally known and the region has been subjected to virtual military occupation.

Moreover, the demands of the kidnapers seemed quite modest, the main one being that fifteen persons seized arbitrarily by the army, for alleged collaboration with the guerrillas, be turned over to the legal authorities. Surely, a "democratic" government would have no problem com-

plying with this. In addition, a ransom of 2,500,000 pesos [one peso equals US\$0.072] was demanded from Díaz's family, one of the richest in the state.

The ransom was paid, apparently without great difficulty, on November 27. The army, however, seemed unable to hand over to the legally competent authorities more than six of the persons it had seized. The governor of Guerrero claimed that "the names or whereabouts of the others were not known."

It was the federal government's involvement that gave the case its nationwide publicity, but the circumstances of this intervention are not yet clear.

Federal authorities, it is reported, arranged to trade nine political prisoners for the rector. Of these, four were from federal jails. Mario Menéndez Rodríguez, editor of the leftist journal *Porqué*; Professor Demóstenes Onofre Valdovinos; and Professor Florentino Jaimes Hernández were released from Lecumberri. Professor Concepción Solís Morales was taken from the women's prison of Santa Marta Acatitla.

## Maspero Fined for 'Defaming' Police

On November 29 another French revolutionist was slapped with a fine for "defaming the police." The Pompidou regime's tactic of harassing journalists with such fines, first used against *Rouge*, weekly journal of the Ligue Communiste (French section of the Fourth International), was directed this time against François Maspero, noted publisher and member of the Ligue.

Maspero was found guilty of publishing an antipolice article in the November 1970 issue of the magazine *Tricontinental*, which he edits.

The article dealt with police repression of radical youth. The defense argued that Maspero had not intended to slander the police in general but only those fascistlike acts of the police that go beyond the normal main-

tenance of order to become genuine political repression. The defense argued further that the intensity of that repression, which Maspero had himself witnessed in the Latin Quarter, fully justified the tone of outrage of the editorial in question.

In rendering its decision, the court said that if certain considerations explained Maspero's desire to oppose fascism, "of which he had undeniably been a victim, these do not entitle him to identify the CRS [the French political police] with the Nazi SS, to use the most insulting invective toward the police in general, in such fashion that in the mind of the reader all police, every member of the CRS, would necessarily be considered a scoundrel." □

To this group five prisoners held in the Guerrero state capital of Chilpancingo were added: Rafael Olea Castañeda, Santos Méndez Bullón, Ceferino Contreras, Ismael Bracho Campos, and Antonio Sotelo Campos. The Guerrero prisoners were allegedly linked to the guerrillas.

All nine released political prisoners were sent into indefinite exile in Cuba.

In the wake of this affair, strict security is being enforced in all southern cities—Acapulco, Taxco, Iguala, Chilpancingo, and Cuernavaca. It is feared that a repression will be launched as soon as the rector is released. □

## Yugoslavia

# Mandel Speaks on Trotskyism

Ernest Mandel, editor of the revolutionary-socialist Belgian weekly *La Gauche* and author of the two-volume treatise *Marxist Economic Theory*, was well received by an audience of some 200 in Belgrade November 22. He spoke on the topic, "The Role of Trotskyism in the Contemporary Worldwide Liberation Movement."

This was the first time since Stalin crushed the Trotskyist movement in the USSR in the thirties that a Trotskyist spokesman has given a public lecture on Trotskyism in a workers state.

The meeting was sponsored by the Student Cultural Center of Belgrade.

Mandel summarized Lenin and Trotsky's concept of world revolution in the imperialist epoch. He analyzed current developments in the anti-imperialist, anticapitalist, and antibureaucratic struggles as well as the role played by the Fourth International in these struggles throughout the world.

One of the features of his lecture was an explanation of the necessity to base workers' power on soviets as the only durable basis for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The liveliness of the discussion period demonstrated the appreciation of the audience for this unusual lecture. Among the questions that came up was the need in Yugoslavia to restore Leon Trotsky to his rightful position. □

## Maoists 'Explain' Peking's Foreign Policy

By Javad Sadeeg

In the September issue of *Communist*, the journal of the Organization of the Communist Revolutionaries (Marxist-Leninist)—a Maoist organization of Iranians outside the country—a lengthy article, "Some Points on the Meaning of the Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China," attempts to justify Mao's line of peaceful coexistence with imperialism.

Some of the arguments are really old, having been used by the Tudeh party years ago. For example, the claim is advanced that the international struggle for socialism can come into contradiction with the national struggle for socialism inside the capitalist countries. The Iranian Stalinists argued along this line after the 1946 events to explain away the capitulation of the Azerbaijan and Kurdistan revolutionary governments to the shah's armies without even a battle. They said that Stalin wanted to preserve world peace.

Today *Communist* uses the same argument to justify Mao's friendly relations with the shah. The same argument can be used to justify Mao's betrayal of the Bangla Desh revolution, the Ceylonese revolution, or any other revolution.

Some of the arguments are new. "The socialist countries," it is claimed, "must vigorously follow the policy of searching for peace and must normalize their relations with different countries *except those countries where revolutionary warfare is being conducted against a reactionary government.*" (Emphasis added.)

While this formula would exclude the normalization of relations with a reactionary government involved in a civil war, as in the case of Thieu's government in South Vietnam, it conspicuously does not exclude normalization of relations with the U.S., where a reactionary government is waging counterrevolutionary war of unprecedented destructiveness against the Vietnamese and other Indochinese peoples.

However, these Maoist theoreticians do not even adhere consistently to

their own formula. In Bangla Desh revolutionary warfare is being conducted against the reactionary government of Pakistan, yet Mao does more than "normalize" relations with Yahya Khan. He sends arms to the butcher to be used against the people of Bangla Desh and holds that the attempt to crush their revolution is Yahya Khan's "internal affair." One would expect some kind of explanation; but, strange as it may seem, Bangla Desh and Pakistan are not mentioned once. Nor is Ceylon.

For the most part, the article consists of contradictory statements that are presented as facts. This greatly facilitates the defense of Mao's foreign policy.

The "main contradiction" of the present epoch, we are told, is the contradiction between imperialism and "social-imperialism" on the one hand and the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America on the other. Since, according to the Maoist line, the Soviet Union became "social-imperialist" after the second world war, this would indicate that the relationship of forces shifted drastically in favor of world impe-

rialism. The conversion of the first workers state into an imperialist power would—if it were true—have far-reaching implications for the perspectives of the world revolution. Later in the article we are told nonetheless that China's current capacity to reach an understanding with the imperialists was made possible by the "relative weakening of world imperialism, especially after the second world war."

The Maoists are finding it increasingly difficult to convince people with such arguments. That is why the theoretical possibility is conceded that "even the government and the Communist party of China" may make mistakes. However, since they are mistakes of the proletariat, they must not be viewed too harshly.

The conclusion that revolutionary China is in the same camp as the "counterrevolutionary Soviet Union" is warned against. With such a conclusion, "one would end up in a Trotskyist and reactionary position echoing the bourgeoisie."

Naturally no explanation is offered as to what the Trotskyist position is and why it should be considered reactionary. It is even doubtful that the editors are acquainted with the Trotskyist position. After all, their aim is not to discuss the real political issues but to prevent a reasoned approach to them, especially by Iranian supporters of the Chinese revolution who have begun to question Maoist policies. □

## Japan

### Massive Strikes Against Okinawa Treaty

Japanese protests against the Okinawa reversion treaty reached a new high on November 19, when more than 2,000,000 workers throughout the country stopped work, demanding that the agreement be renegotiated.

Trains, subways, buses, and taxis were virtually immobilized in most major cities; the postal system, the metal and chemical industries, and mining were also affected.

In the evening, mass rallies and demonstrations were organized, the largest one, in Tokyo, uniting 270,000 protesters.

The November 19 actions followed

more than a week of strikes and protests. On November 10 an estimated 100,000 people (one-tenth of the population) in Okinawa held a twenty-four-hour general strike. Economic functioning of the island, the site of important U.S. military bases, was seriously disrupted by the action, which was supported by members of fifty-nine unions, including Zengunro (the All-Okinawa Military Workers Union).

The major demand of the action was renegotiation of the present reversion treaty drawn up by the United States and the Sato government. The

treaty, already approved by the U. S. Senate, calls for returning nominal sovereignty over the island to Japan, but gives the United States the right to maintain naval, air, and land military bases. It also provides for the transfer of some of Japan's "Self-Defense Forces" to the island.

Other demands of the Okinawa strike included opposition to the stationing of the Self-Defense Forces on the island, an immediate changeover from the dollar to the yen, withdrawal of all U. S. military bases, abrogation of the U. S.-Japan Security Treaty, and establishment of diplomatic relations with China.

The Okinawa action was supported by rallies the same day in 327 places, including a 70,000-strong demonstration in Tokyo.

Protests continued throughout the following week. On November 14, 317 students were arrested after clashes with riot police. About 1,800 were arrested during the November 19 actions. On November 20, the police banned all student demonstrations in Tokyo, after a restaurant was burned down in one of the student-police confrontations.

On November 17 a Diet (parliament) committee approved the draft of the reversion treaty in a maneuver that was described by the opposition parties as a "steamroller tactic." From that day on the opposition boycotted Diet sessions in protest.

But on November 24 the ruling Liberal Democratic party forced through ratification of the treaty in the lower house. The Socialist and Communist parties refused to attend the session. (In all 133 delegates were absent.)

Komeito (Clean Government) and Democratic Socialist delegates suspended their boycott and voted against the treaty; this resulted in a ratification vote of 285 to 273. Apparently in exchange for the attendance of these parties' delegates, Liberal Democrats agreed to vote for two supplementary resolutions submitted by the opposition. One called for a ban on nuclear weapons at the Okinawa military bases; the other called for a reduction in the number of U. S. troops allowed to be quartered there.

The treaty will now be presented to the upper house, where an absolute Liberal Democratic majority assures its passage. But whether the pact will actually become effective remains to be seen. Sato claims that the two sup-

plementary resolutions were already implicit in the original draft of the treaty. It is quite possible, however, that the U. S. government thinks otherwise. The November 1969 joint com-

munique by Sato and Nixon announcing the treaty has been widely interpreted as permitting the installation of nuclear weapons on the island. □

## Haiti

### Nixon to Increase Support for Duvalier?

In 1970, nearly 32,000 Haitians emigrated to the United States to escape the grinding poverty and brutal repression of the Duvalier regime. In New York City alone, the Haitian exile community numbers as many as 200,000, Bill Thompson wrote in the November 29 issue of the liberal weekly *The Nation*.

Most of those who hope to return, according to Thompson, have grouped themselves under an umbrel-

cells and cadres within Haiti, working patiently and secretly toward a *coup d'état*. . . . Up until recently, the Coalition boasted nearly 3,000 members in North America; in 1969, it had a yearly budget of \$60,000, contributed, says Joseph, by businessmen inside Haiti."

The businessmen turned out not to be very reliable allies. When Nixon's special ambassador to Latin America, Nelson Rockefeller, visited Haiti in 1969, he was photographed embracing François Duvalier on the balcony of the presidential palace. Not surprisingly, this was interpreted as a sign of Nixon's approval of the regime, and the businessmen decided that "it was useless to struggle against Duvalier."

Since the death of Duvalier in April and his replacement by his son Jean-Claude, an attempt has been made to dress up the worst aspects of the regime.

"The first move was to invite all political exiles home, with promises of amnesty. Exiles in New York, however, recalling that Papa Doc had used the same ruse a few years ago, were not interested. There also has been talk of disbanding the infamous Tontons Macoutes in favor of the Leopards, a new militia group, but experienced observers know that the Leopards would perform much the same chores as did their predecessors."

These shows of reform have been seized on as sufficient pretext for the U. S. ambassador in Port-au-Prince to recommend massive loans to Duvalier.

"Military aid may also be forthcoming," Thompson wrote. "Certainly, the U. S. warships that have patrolled Haitian waters since Papa Doc's demise have been interpreted by Haitians as fair warning to would-be revolutionaries. And indications are that the Leopards will be trained and equipped by the United States." □



DUVALIER: Renaming Papa Doc's repressive force wins applause from Washington.

la organization called the Haitian Resistance. Although there have been six unsuccessful attempts to invade the country and overthrow the Duvalier regime since 1959, most of the exile groups pin their hopes on another invasion.

"One Haitian who is not impressed by plans for invasion is Raymond Alcide Joseph. . . . He is one of the leaders of the Haitian Coalition, an organization which claims to have

## Workers Demonstrate Against Rising Unemployment

London

The Trades Union Congress (TUC) campaign against rising unemployment culminated November 24 in a mass march through London and a lobby of Parliament. (Unemployment figures now stand at 970,000—the highest in thirty years.)

The action followed a series of regional rallies earlier in November in Glasgow, Coventry, Liverpool, and Cardiff, as well as in London, where on November 6-7 a demonstration organized by the Labour Party Young Socialists brought 2,000 youth into the streets.

Over 15,000 marchers converged on London from all areas of the country November 24. The lobby itself, according to TUC estimates, probably attracted many more again.

The marchers were supported nationwide, according to the November 25 *Daily Mirror*, by "hundreds of thousands of workers [who] downed tools."

The militancy of the march can be gauged by the *Guardian's* comment the following morning that it was "the most hostile demonstration Parliament has seen for many years."

Anger and frustration with government "shake-out" policies, which have added 290,000 to the unemployment queues during the past ten months, manifested themselves in the anti-Tory slogans chanted by the marchers ("Heath Out!") and in their refusal to be manhandled by the police who tried to bar their way into the House of Commons.

The *Guardian* described the scene outside Parliament:

"The trouble began with a noisy, but certainly not vicious crowd, pushing against the foot police cordon. The atmosphere worsened when mounted police moved in to force them back. Banner poles were smashed and hurled at the police. Mirrors were ripped from cars and thrown. Police and demonstrators wrestled and punched—all to a chorus of derision for the Prime Minister and the police and the drumming of fists on car tops."

The action led several MPs from the Labour opposition, which had earlier moved a censure motion against

the government for its employment record, to protest that lobbyists were being denied rightful access.

The mood of the demonstrators on this and the other marches called by the TUC in response to mounting rank-and-file pressure shows the combative spirit of ever wider sections of the labour movement against the Tories' industrial policy. The series of closures (or attempted closures in the case of the Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, where 20,000 workers have been staging a "work-in" for several months) and cutbacks are creating a sense of insecurity even in traditionally "protected" areas of the economy.

In evidence on the demonstration were not only contingents from declining industries (such as ship building in the Clydeside or Merseyside and coal mining in South Wales), which had already felt the cold breeze under Wilson's previous rationalisation schemes. Representatives from more immune sectors such as engineering were also present in force, particularly from the Midlands, the heart of the engineering industry, where Tory policies have forced the unemployment rate 3 percent above the national average.

Jack Jones, general secretary of the Transport and General Workers

Union, the country's largest union, recently pointed out at a rally in Coventry that in the Midlands "fifteen men are after one job."

What is significant about the present unemployment situation—which easily tops 1,000,000 if the many women who work part time and who have been frozen out of the economy are included—is the trend toward a permanent pool of unemployed and a decreasing number of job vacancies.

The Tories hope to use the standing pool of unemployed and the newly passed Industrial Relations Bill to curb wage demands, cow the trade unions, and prepare the way into the Common Market. Their token efforts to counteract unemployment have caused even the usually progovernment *Times* to describe the chancellor's £185,000,000 "public works" programme "as near negligible as makes no difference" and affecting at most only 0.1 percent of the unemployed. The *Times* went on to call the picture "the blackest since the first year of the Second World War."

All indications would seem to point to an increasing upward shift in unemployment figures in all sectors, including the highly skilled graduate market, where the number out of work is the highest ever. □

### New Zealand

## Government Smashes Seamen's Union

By George Fyson

Wellington

The New Zealand government dealt a severe blow to militant trade unionism by its successful deregistration of the Seamen's Union on November 5. The union, formerly the most militant in the country, has had its funds frozen and a new union will have to be built.

The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, by which the union was deregistered, was established to pre-

vent strikes. When fifteen workers in an industry call themselves a "union" and become registered under the Act, this union then legally covers all workers in that industry. Thus there is a lever for employers to force trade unions to register under the Act; if they do not, any fifteen workers can become the official union and supplant the real union. This has happened several times in New Zealand's history when unions have refused to reg-



ister or have been deregistered.

Under the Act, once a union is registered strikes become illegal, and there are stiff penalties specified for individuals, union leaders, and whole unions if strikes do take place.

The pretext for deregistration of the Seamen's Union was a strike in protest of a new anti-seamen piece of legislation—the Shipping and Seamen Amendment Bill—proposed by the government.

The bill, which has now gone through parliament, provides for new supervisory tribunals and committees, on which the Seamen's Union has at best minority representation. In addition, the bill violates civil liberties in many ways. Seamen can be punished for failure to obey a "lawful order," but the bill does not state what a "lawful order" is. Seamen's representatives charged with contravening the decisions of the all-powerful shipping industry tribunal must prove their innocence, instead of being considered "innocent until proven guilty," as required by common law.

By a membership vote of 500 to 80, the Seamen's Union held a three-day work stoppage beginning November 1.

When the seamen voted to continue the strike until November 8, Minister of Labour J. R. Marshall gave them an ultimatum: return to work or face deregistration. The union was deregistered when they refused to inform Marshall whether they would return to work.

During the course of the dispute, the government and press carried out a campaign of vilification against militants in the Seamen's Union. Vicious red-baiting of seamen who were members and sympathisers of the N.Z. Communist party filled many front-page articles. The so-called "red

guard" were alleged to use undemocratic methods to "control" the union.

Marshall was enabled to get away with his attack on the seamen by the failure of the Federation of Labour and the Labour party to come to their defense. When threats of deregistration were first made, the Federation of Labour did not protest, and the Labour party's only comment was that the government was not being firm enough!

Since 1968, when the Arbitration Court—which has final authority on wages under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—gave a nil wage order, unions have increasingly sought to bypass it and establish wage

rates by direct bargaining. The much bigger increases gained since 1968 forced the Tory government to look for a new solution, which it found in the Stabilisation of Remuneration (wage freeze) Act.

However, this is only a temporary measure and the partial break the trade-union movement has made with the arbitration system is a continuing headache for employers. The labour movement needs to proceed to abolish the restrictive Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act altogether in order to allow unions really to develop their power of action. In such circumstances, "deregistration" would be meaningless. □

## To Curtsy or Not To Curtsy?

# Martha Mitchell Defends Democratic Ethic

Martha Mitchell, wife of the U.S. Attorney General, has been known to compare antiwar demonstrations with the Bolshevik revolution. In a recent article for the *Ladies' Home Journal*, however, Mitchell indicated that her confusion on this point is not due to inability to make fine distinctions.

In the article, Mitchell explained why she declined to curtsy when introduced to Queen Elizabeth in London earlier this year. She indicated that she had carefully considered the question in all its possible political ramifications:

"A curtsy is optional for Americans. Each woman has to decide for herself whether she will or won't. . . . I did not, because I feel that an American citizen should not bow to foreign monarchs."

These democratic, leveling sentiments were a bit too much for the Earl of Lindsay, a member of the queen's bodyguard, who fired off a reproachful letter to the upstart.

"It was a very insulting remark to make," Reuters quoted Lindsay as telling reporters, "and I felt she had to be put in her place."

"There is always hope she may learn some manners," he added. "I have never met her and never want to, but I have many good friends in America and I felt she was letting them down."

The earl, it must be said, appears to be behind the times. Now that it is the American, rather than the British, empire on which the sun never sets, the American ruling class adopts its social graces from the military rather than royalty. This, at any rate, would seem to be the meaning of Mitchell's explanation that she "stood to attention when the queen and her husband entered."

As for the earl, Mitchell dismissed him with the suggestion that his letter had

been motivated by glory-seeking: "He just probably wanted to get in on the act."

Mitchell did not specify what "act" she had in mind, but if one bears in mind her husband's ability to invent and pros-



MITCHELL: Annoyed with nobility getting in on her "act."

ecute dramatic "conspiracies" of every description, the earl's "many good friends in America" might be well advised to start looking for good lawyers. □

### COPIES MISSING?

Keep your files of Intercontinental Press complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending 50c per copy. Write for information about previous years.

Intercontinental Press  
P.O. Box 116  
Village P.O. Station  
New York, N.Y. 10014



## A Decisive Phase

By Livio Maitan

[We have translated the following article from the November issue of *Bandiera Rossa*, organ of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari (Revolutionary Communist Groups), the Italian section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The economic crisis that was taking shape at the beginning of this year flowered during the summer and after the end of the vacation period into a full-blown recession, with all the classical symptoms. The downturn is the worst that the Italian capitalist economy has experienced in the post-war period. A new upswing seems all the more problematical, furthermore, because of a number of factors. Other capitalist countries—first of all, the United States—have been hit by a recession as well. In still others, eloquent warning signs have appeared. Moreover, the entire international trade and monetary system has been profoundly shaken.

That the bosses are trying to take advantage of the recession for their own purposes goes without saying. But it would be absurd to proceed from an assumption that the crisis is an invention of the bosses, or little less than that. Today, as always, the recession is the inevitable result of the way the capitalist system works. And this time, I repeat, the cyclical downturn has assumed proportions unprecedented in the last quarter of a century. In order to comprehend the recent developments in the political situation and to try to determine the short- and medium-term trends, we must begin from the standpoint of this economic crisis.

The line the ruling class is following is the same one it has traditionally sought to apply in situations of this type. On the one hand, it is making a strong assault on the level of employment, not only in small and middle-sized industry but also in the big, monopolistic combines, both through layoffs and through reducing the workweek. On the other hand, by means of constant increases in prices—in other words, an inflationary pro-

cess—the capitalists are biting more and more deeply into the wage gains won in the struggles of recent years. It is also likely that the bosses will try once again to impose a "rationalization" scheme, that is, to increase the rate of exploitation (this would necessarily involve restoring managerial authority in the plants, which was profoundly shaken in the three years of the great rise of workers' struggles).

A capitalist offensive along these lines has been in full swing for some weeks, and for the first time since 1968, the working class as a whole has been forced onto the defensive. The stakes, everyone realizes, are extremely high. What is in question is whether or not the bourgeoisie will succeed once more in shifting the weight of the crisis onto the backs of the workers; whether it will succeed in creating a large reserve army of the unemployed, which might not be reabsorbed for a rather long period. (In other words, what seems today to be cyclical unemployment might become more or less chronic, stabilized at a high level, with all the obvious consequences this would have.)

In more general terms, the question is whether the working class will be able to regain the offensive in the near future and resume its rise, or whether it will suffer a defeat, inevitably marking the end of the period that opened in 1968.

Precisely because the stakes are so high, the battle is being fought on all fronts. On the broader political front, the conservative forces are trying to bring about a decisive shift to the right, although for the moment they are unable to replace the center-left formula. At the same time, the fascists and their allies are carrying on a wide range of activities, from goon-squad attacks on workers and students to political maneuvers aimed at forming a "law-and-order coalition." Nor have the fascists neglected demagogic appeals to certain strata of the student population and even of the working class (although for the moment entirely marginal ones).

We must realize clearly that although the bourgeois bloc has not overcome its crisis and the government coalition itself still seems fragile, the economic situation and the attack against the level of employment have made the objective conditions less favorable to the working class than they were a year or even a mere six months ago. This needs to be said, not to inspire an unjustified feeling of resignation but to appeal for the highest sense of political responsibility.

The first conclusion that follows from our premises is that it would be entirely illusory to think that we can win the battle in these crucial weeks by taking on the bosses in individual plants or industries. Although they have, of course, set certain primary objectives, the capitalists have launched a general offensive. There is only one way that it can be repulsed and the conditions created for a counteroffensive by the workers. The overall balance of forces must be shifted in favor of the proletariat, that is, large-scale mobilizations of the workers must be developed that converge in timing and objectives.

If this is not done, the best that can be hoped for is that the workers will be able to win some partial concessions, and we will have to resign ourselves to a retreat on the broad front. Let me be still more specific: It is so important to mount a battle on the entire front, with all the forces mobilized and fighting for the same objectives, that at this precise time particular demands in individual plants or industries must be subordinated, even if they are objectively justified.

The slogans around which to organize this mobilization are those the revolutionary Marxists have consistently put forth since the beginning of the year; these slogans now correspond even more directly and immediately to the needs of the movement. To combat the thrust of inflation and the high cost of living, we must call for the application of a new kind of sliding scale of wages that would effectively guarantee the workers' wages against constant erosion. To the attacks on the level of employment, we must respond by raising the demand for a sliding scale of hours which, in essence, would assure the distribution of what work there is among the workers without layoffs or wage cuts. *The workers must not lose one lira of their wages because of cutbacks in production nor sacri-*

face any of their living standard to rising prices!

These objectives must continue to be linked to the themes of workers' control. The workers, the toilers in general, must exercise direct supervision over price rises, if we are to see a sliding scale that really achieves its aims. The workers must keep a check on production costs and working conditions, rejecting the principle that only the plant managements or individual directors are competent judges of such questions.

It is only on the basis of workers' control that a sliding scale of hours can be applied. Moreover, only workers' control of production tempos, job qualifications, etc., can prevent an increase in the rate of exploitation and a renewed attempt to introduce a rationalization scheme, which would involve squeezing greater profits out of the workers and, at the same time, swelling the army of the unemployed.

On the student front, also, the enemy has moved onto the offensive. The conservatives are continuing the operation they started in the second semester of the last school year, the aim of which is to eliminate the advanced positions of the student movement and—insofar as possible—bring about a return to "normalcy." At the same time, the fascists are stepping up their initiatives with the confidence they have gained from their objectively more favorable position and from their success in the June 13 elections.

These weeks are very important because we are in the period that determines the course of struggles in the schools for the whole year. The students, therefore, must prepare themselves for broader mobilizations, taking account of the specific needs of this phase. First of all, realizing that a defeat of the workers would open the door immediately to a reactionary counterattack on the campuses, the students must take a more determined part in the battle that the proletariat is waging. Any default or passivity in this area would be irresponsible and, in the last analysis, suicidal.

At the same time, any intellectualist tendencies to dismiss demands related to even the most elementary needs of the students (such as the question of school buildings and the content of instruction) must be rejected. This is not only for the general reason that the broad student masses—in particular the new students arriving every year—are sensitive to these questions, but also because the fas-

cists are waging a demagogic campaign on these issues. And the fascists might gain a general political advantage by moving in to fill any gaps that the left and the revolutionary forces failed to close. Finally, the students must not neglect internationalist mobilizations; the demonstrations coming up November 6 against the imperialist war in Vietnam offer an immediate opportunity for such work.

But one thing above all must be clear to the workers and students. The present period demands unity—unity among all sectors of the working class, unity between the workers and the other strata of the working masses, unity among the revolutionary van-

guard groups, and unity between the vanguard groups and the trade-union organizations.

In the struggles in progress, the unions are destined to play a leading role, and we must demand that they accept their full responsibility and prepare the way for a determined struggle on a general scale, without any hesitation, self-paralyzing maneuvers, or illusory hopes. We must demand unity between the workers' and student movements.

*We must struggle to win the objectives imposed by the needs of this phase without losing any precious time. We must fight on the line of a united front of the workers!* □

## Paris Committee Scores Repression in Peru

[The following declaration of solidarity with the victims of repression in Peru has been translated from the November 27 issue of *Rouge*, the weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The Peru Solidarity Committee has learned of the following facts:

1. On Thursday, November 11, extremely grave events occurred in the Cobriza copper mine, operated by the North American company Cerro de Pasco Corporation. *Eight miners were shot to death*, more than twenty seriously wounded, and fifty-five thrown into prison. These events occurred during a general strike called by fourteen unions representing more than 13,000 miners. The lawyer for the striking workers, Genaro Ledesma, was also arrested.

2. A savage repression was launched against the striking teachers. The top union leaders were brutally deported to Europe, without even being allowed to pack a suitcase. Seven professors and one student, Rolando Breña, president of the national commission of the Student Federation of Peru, now find themselves in Madrid with no means of support.

3. The peasant leader Hugo Blanco, arrested in Lima, was released from prison only to be deported to Mexico.

4. Jacqueline Lobatón, general secretary of CODDEH (and widow of

Guillermo Lobatón, a guerrilla commander murdered by the army), and Nique de la Puente, an officer of the Student Federation of the University of San Marcos, have just been arrested in Lima.

The repressive atmosphere in Peru intensifies daily. This repression against the Peruvian people is a severe attack on the most elementary human rights, all the more scandalous in that it is conducted by a government calling itself "popular and humanist."

The members of the Peru Solidarity Committee vigorously protest this brutal repression and express their indignation over the tragic events at the Cobriza copper mine, in which eight miners lost their lives.

Prof. Alfred Kastler; Jean-Paul Sartre; Simone de Beauvoir; Michel Leiris; Charles Bettelheim; Edgar Morin; Marguerite Duras; Daniel Guérin; Jean Schuster; Nathalie Sarraute, Daniel Mayer, president of the League for the Rights of Man; J.J. de Felice, doctor of law; A. Pieyre de Mandiargues; Manville, doctor of law; Simone Signoret; Maurice Nadeau; Anne Philipe; Louis Daquin; Yves Montand. □

### Doesn't Believe "Wages" Cause Inflation

A committee of the House of Commons has proposed raising Queen Elizabeth's annual salary from the equivalent of \$1,870,000 to \$2,450,000. Elizabeth said she needed the raise because of inflation.

### U.S. Liberals in Pursuit of the Youth Vote

A full year before the 1972 U.S. presidential elections, efforts are under way to draw the newly enfranchised young voters out of the mass movements and into the capitalist electoral machine. Various "Dump Nixon" schemes, aimed at electing a liberal Democratic president, have been launched.

In the space of two weeks, three national conferences were held, all designed to attract youth to the politics of "realism" and away from "unrealistic" mass action.

The largest, held in Chicago December 4-5 under the auspices of the "Emergency Conference for New Voters," was the most straightforward in presenting its views. It was organized by a collection of student-government presidents and the Association of Student Governments.

The declared purpose was to create a "National Youth Caucus" to cooperate with the Black and Women's caucuses in urging that the Democratic party select a presidential candidate who would pledge to end the Indo-China war and reorient the country's priorities.

The workshops held at the meeting — how to pack a precinct caucus, how to raise money, how to register new voters, etc. — were geared toward winning delegates at the Democratic party convention. "We're going to play their game," said one participant. "Hopefully, we'll play it better than they will," added another.

The previous weekend about 400 ex-members of the now defunct Students for a Democratic Society had met in Iowa to form the "New American Movement," a group the participants hope will function in the manner of the SDS of the middle 1960s. Activities would revolve around "local issues" of a social-worker variety, and mass demonstrations would be shunned until large numbers of workers were ready to march.

The third meeting, held in Dallas, Texas, November 24-28, launched still another "new" political formation: the People's party. Attended by 200 delegates, most of them members of the Peace and Freedom party and the New party (two previous unsuccessful

attempts at forming a bourgeois radical party), the conference voted to launch a "stand-in" presidential and vice-presidential ticket composed of peace activist Benjamin Spock and liberal civil-rights advocate Julius Hobson. A stand-in ticket is one that would be withdrawn should the Democrats nominate a liberal candidate like Eugene McCarthy or Edward Kennedy.

Although it was held in Texas, where Chicanos have organized the most successful independent political

party to date (La Raza Unida party), the conference did not define its relationship to that formation, and no members of La Raza Unida attended.

Programmatic documents on various questions were discussed, but no agreement was reached, and the party's platform was submitted to a steering committee.

The grand historical aims of the People's party were expressed by Marcus Raskin, one of the party's theoreticians. "The size of our vote depends on whom the Democrats choose," he said. "If it's someone like Teddy Kennedy or George McGovern, our vote will be very small. If they name someone else, the vote could be reasonable, as high as 5 percent." □

### U.S.A.

### Charge Textile Industry Paid Off Nixon



THURMOND: Loyal political servant of U. S. textile interests.

Thurmond (Dixiecrat Republican) of South Carolina.

The industry chiefs, Anderson wrote, offered Nixon a contribution "in six figures." Nixon "was asked, in return, for a statement promising to limit textile imports.

"Nixon not only agreed to issue the statement, but it was released from the office of none other than Strom Thurmond. Later, Nixon put out another statement in Greensboro, N. C., reiterating his support of the textile industry."

Anderson noted that Nixon's position on textiles contrasted remarkably with his campaign call for "moving ahead toward freer trade rather than protection." Nixon claimed at the time that the textile industry had a "special problem."

The U. S. Tariff Commission, however, said that textile companies had "enjoyed a period of unparalleled growth since the early 1960s" and that "there has been a marked expansion in sales, employment, and new investment in plant and equipment. Similarly, overall corporate profits increased."

The amount finally kicked in to Nixon's campaign fund by the textile industry, Anderson said, surpassed \$300,000. But the "textile quotas [Nixon] has squeezed out of Japan will wind up costing the consumers billions in higher clothing prices. This illustrates how a few hundred thousand dollars in campaign contributions can buy millions in special benefits."

Anderson reported that Thurmond admitted soliciting Nixon's statement on textile imports, but the senator denied knowing anything about the contribution to the campaign. □

# REVIEWS

## A Concrete Account of the Crisis in Ireland

By Gerry Foley

*Géarchéim in Éirinn* (Crisis in Ireland) by Dick Walsh. Foilseacháin Náisiúnta Tta., Baile Atha Cliath, Éire. 168 pp., 105 new pence (approximately \$2.62). 1972.

There is already a fairly large number of topical books on the Irish situation by both journalists and professors in Great Britain as well as in Ireland. Dick Walsh's *Géarchéim in Éirinn* is the pick of those I have read—the most concrete, the most perceptive, and the best written. It is also the first, to my knowledge, to treat the crisis in Ireland as a whole, rather than concentrating solely on the North.

Starting off from the case of the Irish government ministers accused in May 1970 of illegally importing guns, Walsh brings into focus the crisis that has been developing for the last three or four years in both Irish states.

"After Charles Haughey and Neil Blaney [the principal figures in the arms trials] were finally ousted from the cabinet," Walsh writes, "some officials in the Special Branch [the political police] in Dublin feared that a coup d'état would be carried out in the republic.

"They kept a close watch on members of the government and on other important men, including trade-union leaders. . . .

"It is unlikely that any coup would have taken place, but these precautions are a sign of the uncertainty and fantastic apprehensions that prevailed. . . .

"But perhaps the trials were only a symbol of the way the economic and social changes of the 1960s turned political life in Ireland upside down. On the other hand, as regards the trials, the origins of secrecy, militarism, and intrigue lie in the history of Ireland.

"The leaves were rustling long before the wind rose."

Walsh's journalistic talent for giving a dramatic focus to the unfolding of events gives his account form and

forcefulness. This is a method, moreover, that can be used effectively only by a writer with a thorough knowledge of a situation and a certain feel for it.

Walsh does not resort to any of the easy images or commonplace political notions British writers in particular are apt to rely on in presenting the situation in Ireland.

It might be expected that Walsh's book would be less superficial than most of those produced for the Anglo-American market, since the language it is written in limits its audience essentially to Ireland and to relatively limited circles even there. Furthermore, most of the readers for such a book would probably have learned Irish and should therefore be more patriotic or more educated, or both, than the average citizen.

However, Walsh's publishers apparently felt that such a book was so unusual that they had to print an apology on the jacket to soften the blow: "Dick Walsh has a very radical point of view, but as is proper for a professional political commentator, he separates fact from opinion." (*Dear Walsh ar an saol ach, mar is dual don tráchtair gairmiúil polaitiocha, déanann se idirdhealú idir fríctí agus tuairimí.*)

In a broad sense, Walsh seems to reflect the new radical thinking of younger people in Ireland. He is a thirty-four-year-old staff writer for the *Irish Times*, which is not only the country's most authoritative daily but, by an odd historical accident, perhaps the only major paper in the Western world that offers a relatively open forum for left ideas.

Walsh is an unusual reporter, moreover, in that he is apparently familiar both with the intrigues of bourgeois politics and with the world of young radicals. Walsh's critique of Irish society is not very original but it is sharp:

"In the Twenty-Six Counties, the need for radical change was averted through an outflow of the unemployed and discontented. Emigration was a great safety valve. It sent to the British labor market, with its more numerous jobs and better social services, the men, women, and children the state could do without. In this way the danger of revolution was reduced.

"Both governments, in the North and in the South, promised to end emigration. Perhaps they did not regard it as a safety valve. But they could not have failed to recognize its effectiveness as a means for perpetuating their power."

And a little further on, Walsh says: "The two big movements in the country, populism [i.e., Fianna Fáil, the ruling party in the South] and Unionism, have managed to win lasting support from workers, farmers, and businessmen—classes you would not expect to have the same aims in everyday life."

Like most younger people in Ireland, Walsh has no respect for Fianna Fáil or the kind of pseudonationalism represented by De Valera. But in trying to understand the contradictions of this demagogic formation, he turns to some rather fuzzy bourgeois political science, to an abstract concept of "populism." "Populism is in favor of religion but against clericalism. . . .

### Still Available

Complete Back Files

### Intercontinental Press

1966	42 issues	\$21.00
1967	42 issues	\$21.00
1968	44 issues	\$22.00
1969	43 issues	\$21.50
1970	43 issues	\$21.50

P. O. Box 116  
Village P. O. Station  
New York, N. Y. 10014

It has a strong tendency toward a mild form of racism—the good, ordinary people have different lineage than the bad ascendancy."

Again like most young radicals in Ireland, Walsh seems to feel that the national question is at fault for Irish politics being frozen in a reactionary mold and that polarization on class lines would open up the way to progress.

This attitude is positive in that it reflects an understanding, however incipient, that socialism, the political ex-

pression of working-class interests, is the only solution to the problems facing the country. But by itself this concept is too general to be of much use as a guide in analyzing or changing Irish political life.

However, Walsh does not try to answer the questions posed by his dramatic portrayal of the crisis in Ireland. He is satisfied, for the most part, simply to point up these implications in a thoughtful way. And that is a great deal for a book of this genre. □

## Three Revolutionary Plays in London

London seems to have broken out with a spate of revolutionary plays. Foremost was the short season of the Théâtre du Soleil of Paris, playing *1789* in the converted railroad structure known as the Roundhouse, in the original French, with only sporadic English translation in one scene.

Then there is the performance of *Danton's Death* (by the young nineteenth-century revolutionary German playwright Georg Büchner) in the New Theatre with Christopher Plummer and a National Theatre company.

Finally there is *Tyger*, a musical about the life of the great William Blake, poet, painter, and engraver of genius; a revolutionist who supported the French revolution against the reactionary tide in England. The script of the musical was written by Adrian Mitchell, the present-day revolutionary poet.

*1789* was sold out for every show, weeks in advance. The other two are playing to packed houses in the National Theatre repertory productions whenever they are shown.

### 1789

If one were asked to state briefly what *1789* is about, it would be easiest to say: "It is about the permanent revolution." Everything in this two-and-a-half-hour, constantly moving, continually enthralling, absorbing spectacle points in that direction. Marat and Babeuf wind up making the point distinct: the revolution is unfinished. It will succeed only when the poor, i. e., the people, really rule.

A scene is included before the fall

of the Bastille in which the agitators move in groups among the standing audience, the actresses speaking French, the actors English simultaneously. This tends to be a little hard on the ears. At the performance I attended, a member of the audience, caught up in the spirit of 1789, gave an unscheduled speech. "Today, in 1971," he concluded, "the revolution started then has not yet been completed. It is up to us, to you and me, to finish the job!"

This was audience participation that theatrical producers dream of, but seldom get. The Théâtre du Soleil of Paris, performing in French at the Roundhouse, accomplished this feat. The language did not matter. The powerful mimicry, the swift movement across half a dozen stages, the multiplicity of devices—from acrobatics to puppetry—just swept the crowd standing in the centre of the pit along, all the way from beginning to end.

The ending reminded one of Trotsky's remark about Babeuf being the link between the French and the Russian revolutions.

### Danton's Death

*Danton's Death*, the gripping story of the tribune of the people turned profligate in 1794 before being sent to the guillotine, is a vehicle in which the author—he was twenty-one when he wrote the play and only twenty-three when he died—propagates the view that revolutions have objective, deep-rooted causes and that individual leaders play only secondary roles.

Played with great force and skill

by Christopher Plummer, Danton is a memorable figure as the wanton cynic who cannot forget his revolutionary past. He is Büchner's mouthpiece.

Only the part of the all-important Robespierre seems to have been miscast; and a major speech of his—in which he defends the terror against counterrevolutionary aristocrats on the right and those on the left who want to abolish private property—appears to have been dropped.

Some of the speeches are taken from the historic record.

Danton's last appearance before the tribunal of the Committee of Public Safety, a duel in words with Saint-Just, is the climax of the drama.

Saint-Just demands preemptorily: "Your name, Citizen."

Danton begins with: "Soon I shall reside in the void but (contemptuously spat out) my name shall remain in the pantheon of history."

He then recalls how he led the storming of the Tuileries and most other assaults on the old regime in the early nineties. Derision is his reply to the charge that he, Camille Desmoulins, and their friends conspired with Mirabeau, Lafayette, and the aristocrats against the republic.

### Tyger

What links *Tyger* to the other two plays is what it shows of the French revolution's influence on the radical movement in Britain in conflict with King George III and his prime minister, Lord North, and later, William Pitt. Blake was one of the luminaries of that movement, shadowed by military intelligence, framed up but released after a trial, hounded by reaction but unbending.

Little of Blake's great poetry comes through, except for "Tyger! Tyger! burning bright/In the forests of the night. . ." from which the musical gets its title. But Adrian Mitchell's lines are themselves amusing, often stirring in song and story.

There is also not a hint of Blake's mysticism, which was at odds with his revolutionary rationalism. Perhaps it would be asking too much of a musical to give such a balanced portrait of its hero.

All in all, three plays that contribute to the continuing radicalization of British youth.

— T. J. O'Flaherty

Intercontinental Press

## Hundreds of Unionists Among Ceylon Prisoners

[The following interview with Jack Baker is reprinted from the November 17 issue of *Tribune*, the newspaper of the Australian Communist party.

[Baker is general secretary of the Union of Postal Clerks and Telegraphists. He visited Ceylon for ten days at the end of June. *Tribune* did not indicate any reason for its delay in publishing the interview.]

\* \* \*

*Question. What were your first impressions of Ceylon?*

*Answer.* I found the country under emergency conditions. There was a strict curfew and all trade union activities were banned. There was a strict censorship of the press and in particular the working class press. There was a ban on public meetings except those allowed by the police commissioner.

I was the guest of the Ceylon Postal and Telegraphists Officers' Association who arranged my itinerary. During my inspection of the union's facilities and of postal and telegraphic communications, I first ran into reports of young people who had disappeared without trace following attacks by groups of young people on police stations. In all cases, postal workers were speaking of relatives who had since disappeared both before and after the youth attacks, and of whom they had had no information whatsoever.

It was through the postal workers' union that I made contact with other unions and political groups in Ceylon and composed the following picture: three to four hundred trade union officials have disappeared since the youth attacks notwithstanding the fact that the unions pledged support to the Bandaranaike government at that time, and tried to organise collections of money from workers to support the government at the time of the youth revolt.

*Q. Why, then, were these union leaders arrested?*

A. No one I spoke to knew why the union leaders had been arrested—neither the union officials I spoke to nor the families of those arrested. All requests for information and charges met with evasion or silence from the Minister. There was not much questioning of the government because that invariably led to further arrest or the disappearance of union officials.

What has frightened many officials is that they know that considerable violence and even torture of people under arrest

have been documented—some inadvertently.

The police and military are, after all, given full legal authority under the emergency laws to dispose of any bodies of persons who die under detention or arrest, by fire or any other means, without any right to demand an inquest, etc.

*Q. What unions were affected by arrests?*

A. None of the officials of the independent (politically unaffiliated) postal workers' union had been arrested.

I then went to the offices of the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) led by Mr. Bala Tampoe, who was in Australia for the National Anti-War Conference earlier this year.

He said forty-eight of CMU office-bearers from branch and shop committees had disappeared and were presumably under arrest. He provided me with a list of names, their place of employment, and the union position held. They came from a total of twenty-two different industrial and commercial enterprises.

From Associated Motorways, for example, eight shop-committee members had been arrested (including three office-bearers). One CMU executive member, T. Premasiri, a worker at Kumdanmal Industries, was arrested. One worker from Times of Ceylon (the biggest newspaper combine), a member of the CMU committee there, was arrested . . . and so on.

The remaining top officials of a group of unions linked with the Maoist CP (Marxist-Leninist) were few in number when I spoke to them. Many of them had been arrested. They detailed to me area leaders and rank-and-file activists arrested and disappeared.

Generally, I gained the impression that wherever union leaders tried to oppose the employers' offensive against the workers, there were arrests and disappearances.

The Maoists, by the way, were deeply worried by the reported gift of 92 million rupees [about US\$15,460,000] by People's China to the Bandaranaike government just after the Maoist union leaders had been arrested.

The unions led by the Communist Party of Ceylon (which supports Moscow), organised in the Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions (CFTU), did not appear to have suffered as much as some other groups, but those in the CFTU with whom I had discussions seemed very uncertain of the future. I have since learnt coming home that four of the union leaders of the CFTU have been indicted simply because they discussed strike action against an employer.

I found the Ceylon Federation of Labor (CFL), associated with the LSSP

(Lanka Sama Samaja Party)—note that all union centres are based on political affiliations—uncommunicative, but I learnt from others that some CFL union officials and shop committee delegates had been arrested in some areas at the request of employers.

*Q. How generalised did you think this sort of thing was?*

A. From my investigations as a whole I had to conclude that any local employer could bring about the immediate arrest of a trade union official in his employment, without any charges necessarily being laid against him or any information being made available as to where and why he was being held. Up till now none of the union officials arrested have been charged or proceeded against . . .

The political parties in the government coalition (the CP, the LSSP, and the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom party]) protest the arrests of leaders, but the political parties have a peculiar form of control over the unions and seem to use the unions for electoral mobilisation. It appeared, in general, that all were immobilised by the general consensus of all the world powers—the US, USSR, China, Yugoslavia, India, Pakistan, etc.—with the Bandaranaike government.

*Q. Did you reach any conclusion as to the cause of the youth revolt?*

A. Many different groups, from the CIA to the North Koreans to the CP (Moscow), have been blamed for the revolt, but I am sure none of them were responsible. I am convinced that the youth who launched the attacks on police stations were provoked into it by certain elements within the Bandaranaike government, and were pushed into a situation of defending themselves from attacks by the police and the government. It is clear that these same youth worked for the election of the government and were even key to the united front victory. I include here the LSSP and CP Youth Leagues as well as the JVP [Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna] (People's Liberation Front). The JVP in particular, however, continued to press the coalition for the implementation of its electoral promises.

The government, however, instead put itself into the hands of the IMF [International Monetary Fund] and World Bank, which in turn put demands on the government for the dropping of the free rice issue, raising transport fares, reduction of free medical services and free education, etc. To get the IMF aid, the government had to turn against the masses.



I am convinced it consciously decided to do this.

Some elements in the government such as the Minister for Justice contrived a confrontation with the youth. This opened the way for repression of the youth and a full-scale attack on the trade union movement and democratic rights in Ceylon.

If you look at countries where military or oligarchic cliques have taken power in Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Burma, etc.), they have often come to power through a deliberately contrived provocation, to hit particularly the unions.

My conclusions are also backed by the little-known findings of well-known Marxist sociologist Prof. Rene Dumont of France, on repression in Ceylon.

*Q. Does the situation continue?*

A. The day I left, unions were refused permission for a general public meeting to protest against apartheid in South Africa and call for the release of political prisoners there. The government refused permission for the meeting.

Arrest of union rank and file and officials continues.

When I left Ceylon, I wrote to Mrs. Bandaranaike appealing for information on a whole number of points, particularly concerning political prisoners. I received a letter from the Secretary of the Minister of Defence and External Affairs in Ceylon, dated August 2, which side-stepped every question concerning the 14,000 detained.

*Q. What do you see as the perspectives in Ceylon?*

A. I spoke to many ordinary workers in Kandy, Colombo, and down the south coast. They seemed completely cynical and disillusioned with the government and all the political parties. They seemed ripe for a right-wing coup by the worst elements.

The leadership of the working class traditional parties—the LSSP and CP (Moscow)—seem isolated from the mass of workers.

The workers are also demoralised and disarmed by the world unanimity in helping the repression.

As I left the airport for India, MIG fighters were flying missions against the thousands of youth still existing in the jungles. It was strange, too, to see Pakistani and Indian gunboats standing guard side by side in support of the regime, and taking up friendly positions together against the young people and unem-ployed.

### **When You Move...**

Don't count on the post office forwarding your Intercontinental Press! It's against their rules.

Send us your new address. And in plenty of time, please.

I was told that Yahya Khan, of Pakistan, contributed twice as many helicopters to suppress the Ceylon revolt as he did to aid the millions of flood victims in East Bengal some time ago.

## **Repression of Striking Peruvian Miners**

[The following statement was issued in late November by the Comité pro Libertad de los Detenidos Político-Sociales (Committee for the Release of the Political and Social Prisoners) in Lima, Peru. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

In the recent period, the Junta Militar de Gobierno [Military Council of Government] has launched a violent police and military repression against the Cerro de Pasco miners. It has also attacked the popular organizations backing the miners' struggle for better living standards, better working conditions, and nationalization of this imperialist corporation, one of the three largest in Peru.

At the end of October, the 20,000 workers in the Cerro de Pasco mines mobilized in a powerful campaign to back up a list of demands they handed the management. When attempts at conciliation failed, the military government unleashed a brutal repression in an attempt to break the workers' movement and eliminate the trade-union organizations leading the strike. By these methods, it also sought to prevent other popular organizations from offering solidarity and support.

On November 9, the government issued a decree suspending constitutional guarantees in the departments of Huancavelica, Pasco, and Junín, as well as in the province of Huarochiri, which forms part of the department of Lima. Under cover of this decree police and military forces seized control of the fourteen Cerro de Pasco mining centers. In the course of their operation, the repressive forces committed the following crimes.

● The "counterinsurgency battalion" called the Sinchis, a ranger unit specializing in antiguerrilla repression, stormed the Cobriza mining center on November 10, seizing the union headquarters, where the workers made a stand.

● The attack of the Sinchis resulted in the fatal shooting of Pablo Inza,

I should also mention that the aboriginal minority living in the jungles of Ceylon have been strafed and bombed.

I can't therefore be very optimistic about the situation in Ceylon.

general secretary of the Cobriza local, and the workers Daniel Laura Espinoza, Eusebio Quiroz, Pablo Soto Meza, and a fifth, still unidentified, miner. This is the official casualty list, and it is to be feared that the actual number of victims will turn out to be still higher.

● More than two dozen workers have received gunshot wounds, and the lives of some of them are in danger.

● Fifty mine-union leaders have been arrested and taken to various cities, including Lima.

● The following have also been arrested: Genaro Ledesma Izquieta, the legal adviser of the Federación de Trabajadores Mineros y Metalúrgicos del Centro [Central Region Mine and Metal Workers' Federation]; Jacqueline Lobatón, the head of the Comité de Defensa de los Derechos Humanos [Committee for the Defense of Human Rights]; Dr. José Rojas, the union's physician; and José Nique de la Fuente, president of the Federación de Estudiantes de la Universidad de San Marcos [Student Federation of the University of San Marcos].

The repressive measures against the workers are continuing at this time. There is a clear threat of repression against the left and popular organizations. We wish to call the attention of national and international public opinion to these events and appeal urgently for solidarity with the mine workers.

P. S. A late report informs us that the number of dead in Cobriza has reached twenty-nine and that more than sixty persons have been sent to the jungle prison of El Sepa. On the other hand, Jacqueline Lobatón has been released.

[Letters and telegrams protesting the government's latest repression can be sent to: Presidente de la Republica del Perú, Gral. Juan Velasco Alvarado, Palacio Gobierno, Lima, Peru. Copies should be sent to the Comité pro Libertad de los Detenidos Político-Sociales, Apartado 10149, Lima, Peru.]



# Protest the Repression in Peru!

[The following statement was issued November 16 in Lima by the well-known Peruvian revolutionist Ricardo Gadea. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

In recent days, the Peruvian military junta has continued to use violent, repressive measures against the revolutionary left, the workers' movement, and the popular organizations. By this it has clearly demonstrated its fear of the people and its determination to block a revolutionary mobilization of the masses.

In flagrant contradiction to its "revolutionary" propaganda, the military junta did not hesitate on November 9 to declare a *state of siege* in three departments and a province in the central part of the country.\* Under cover of a suspension of constitutional guarantees, the police and military forces began a large-scale repressive operation, trying to break the strike of 15,000 workers belonging to fourteen unions at the Cerro de Pasco Corporation, a greedy, imperialist company whose nationalization is demanded by the most conscious sectors of our people.

In the past week, around fifty leaders of the miners in the central region were arrested, along with the two

\* Peru is divided administratively into twenty-three departments plus the constitutional province of Callao, which includes the port of Lima. — *IP*

legal advisers and the doctor of the Federación de Trabajadores Metalúrgicos y Mineros del Centro [Central Region Mine and Metal Workers Federation]. Also arrested were eight teachers, the head of the Comité de Defensa de los Derechos Humanos [Committee to Defend Human Rights], and other persons. But this was not all. The notorious "Sinchis"—a ranger unit with special counterinsurgency training—stormed union headquarters in the Cobriza mining center November 10, killing five workers, including Pablo Inza, general secretary of the union, and wounding many others.

Coming only two months after the brutal measures used to break the strike of 100,000 teachers—measures which included deporting a group of union leaders along with political figures like Hugo Blanco and Rolando Breña—this latest repression shows that the military junta is reverting to the standard "gorilla" approach in dealing with the people. In face of these repressive measures against the people, no argument by the government or its apologists is going to take in anyone.

The government's campaign, trying to blame the strikes on "ultraleft" groups, is only a smoke screen to cover up the repression against the workers' movement.

In view of these events, it is urgent to arouse public opinion, to break the wall of silence built up by the propaganda of scabs and government apologists. Solidarity actions are of the utmost importance. □

## Position of the PRT in Uruguayan Elections

[The following article was published in the November 22 issue of *Tendencia Revolucionaria*, the organ of the PRT (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores — Revolutionary Workers party, a group adhering to the Fourth International) on the eve of the elections in Uruguay. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*. The subheadings appear in the original.]

\* \* \*

In our last issue we devoted our front-page headlines and an article

to analyzing our slogan: "Fight, Fight, Until We Win a Workers' and People's Government." In that article, we noted that our slogan was the best expression, the synthesis of the program of the Lista Obrera [Workers' Slate]. This was because it projected the only fundamental solution for the workers, a solution on the agenda for today and not for a more or less distant future.

The slogan means that *the working class must fight now for a workers' and people's government* that will eliminate the present bourgeois sys-

tem and build socialism in our country.

In this issue we want to take up why the Lista Obrera of the FA [Frente Amplio—Broad Front] is the only slate in the elections whose program supports not only antioligarchic and anti-imperialist demands but which is clearly antibourgeois, anti-capitalist, and prosocialist.

In order to put this analysis in its context, we will begin by analyzing some facts that more clearly define the objectives of the program of the Lista Obrera.

### The Revolutionary Left and the Elections

The approach of the elections and, above all, the emergence of the FA led the entire Uruguayan revolutionary left in the first months of the year to discuss what position they should take toward the electoral process.

At that time the discussion centered around whether or not the revolutionary left should participate in a bourgeois process like the elections, a process designed to preserve the system. This purely theoretical and moralistic focus made the polemics totally abstract and unable to answer what should have been the fundamental questions:

● To what extent did our people still have illusions about the electoral process, and had the FA emerged as a mass anti-imperialist movement?

● What policy should the revolutionary left follow in participating in this process?

The discussion was adjourned without these two aspects, especially the second, being clarified. A few months later, only a few sectors of the revolutionary left remained outside the FA, cut off from the process in which the masses were involved. At the same time, most of the sectors that joined the FA did so without defining what policy they were following and thus without coming to any agreement, not even on the most elementary basic points.

### The PRT and Its Course in the FA

The PRT was one of the first sectors of the revolutionary left to explain the need to join the FA, the Front's progressive aspects, the significance of the fact that the first mass anti-imperialist movement in our country was organizing around it, and the fact that it was rupturing

the classical, bourgeois two-party system. But we were also the first and the only ones to warn about the characteristics of the FA's leadership, that it was not in the hands of any sectors of the working class but of the petty-bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie, and the reformists.

We maintained that revolutionists should be in the ranks of the FA the better to challenge the nonproletarian majority in the policy-making bodies for the leadership of the Front, in order to put it at the service of the workers and make it an instrument for mobilizing them against the bosses and the government.

As part of this conception we maintained that the candidates put up by the FA should be selected through a deepgoing process of discussion in the local organizations, the Committees. We made it clear that we would fight for *workers' candidates*, the only guarantee to the workers that the program would be scrupulously carried out.

In the discussion on the role and function of the Committees, our party was the only organization that held that they should be involved directly in decision-making through *plenary assemblies of delegates meeting to formulate policy and plan the political campaigns in which the Front was to engage*.

In the discussion on the paths of action, we maintained that the FA had to adopt all the methods taken up by the masses, whether or not they were considered legal by the government. After all the repression

against the mass movement in recent years, we argued, it was impossible for the FA to propose to limit itself to "the peaceful road." We maintained the position that the FA should not consider its most important task to be electoral propaganda but rather the axis of its activity should be participation in all manifestations of the class struggle.

### Capitulation Under the Label of Unity

Of all the sectors of the nonreformist left that joined the FA after the first two months of debating whether or not to participate in the elections—as we have seen above—none but our party raised its voice even to claim the right of the working class to an independent policy of its own. None but our party raised its voice to expose the petty-bourgeois and reformist character of the Front's leadership.

A year ago this same left was singing the praises of armed struggle and the Tupamaros. Now, in the name of "antioligarchical and anti-imperialist unity," these groups consider it entirely "proper" and "normal" for the FA to be led predominantly by bourgeois or petty-bourgeois currents working hand in glove with the reformists. This left suddenly forgot that it has been the workers, revolutionary students, and popular sectors that have in recent years borne the brunt of exploitation and violent and bloody confrontations with the bosses and the government.

Unfortunately, this "unity" rested on nothing but capitulation to the nonproletarian sectors of the FA. When the time came for action, the leaderships of the same left that carried on such zealous theoretical polemics at the start of the year forgot the experience their own rank and file had gained in the class struggle against reformism and the bourgeoisie. They ended up supporting "unity" on the reformist pattern.

How can groups claiming to be revolutionary say that they support all the choices under the FA label? How can they claim that the Lista Obrera, which maintains the need for liquidating capitalism and building socialism, is the same as the reformist slate or the petty-bourgeois slates?

### The Workers' Interests and the Lista Obrera

It should be easy enough for the compañeros reading this to deduce why the Lista Obrera is the only slate that raises antibourgeois and socialist slogans in its program.

The program of the Lista Obrera is the distillation of the principles the PRT has defended for a year inside the FA, an example of how revolutionists must utilize an electoral process enabling them to take their positions to the masses.

However, an opportunity to talk to the masses must not be used to create false illusions but to tell them with absolute clarity what the historical experience of the working class throughout the world has confirmed *ad nauseam*. The workers cannot expect any other sector of society, no matter how well intentioned, to solve their problems. There are no "intermediate," "humanist socialist," "non-Marxist," etc., etc., regimes of the sort postulated by some groups.

We revolutionary Marxists must be very clear and tell the masses every time we have an opportunity for a dialogue with them that *socialism is the only solution, but there is no socialism save that of Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky, socialism built under the leadership of the working class*.

Anything else, even if it presents itself under the attractive name of "unity," is a lie, at best a pious one.

Therefore, the Lista Obrera is the only slate that raises the following slogans: *Down with imperialism and the bourgeois system! For a Workers' and People's Government that will build socialism!* □

## How to subscribe

If you'd rather not cut up this issue by using the subscription blank . . .  
Jot your name and address on any old piece of paper and send it with  
\$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

Intercontinental Press  
P. O. Box 116  
Village P. O. Station  
New York, N. Y. 10014

[ ] Enclosed is \$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_